

A N
A N S W E R

T O

J O S E P H J E N K S S Reply to
W I L L I A M W I L K I N S O N S

T R E A T I S E,

E N T I T U L E D,

The Baptism of the H O L Y S P I R I T,
without Elementary Water, demon-
stratively proved to be the true B A P-
T I S M of C H R I S T, &c.

By W I L L I A M W I L K I N S O N.

*Eph. 4. 5. One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism. 1 Cor.
12. 13. For by one Spirit are we all Baptized into one
Body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we
be Bond or Free ; and have been made all to drink into
one Spirit.*

L O N D O N: Printed and Sold by the
Assigns of J. Sowle, at the Bible in George-Yard
in Lombard Street, 1721.

b
 b
 w
 B
 fu
 C
 ft
 tu

 G
 en
 ri
 Fe
 Ca
 liv
 th
 th
 th
 aw
 ing
 rif
 ver
 pre
 Ba
 are

J. M. P. H.

THE
PREFACE.

C Andid Reader, in the Preface to my Friend *William Wilkinson's Answer to John Hammett*, I conceive I briefly manifested the Ordinances of Christ to be purely Spiritual and Agreeable to the Nature of the blessed Dispensation, of spiritual Light and Glory, under which we live, this admits of no legal Shadow, or *Jewish* Ceremony; since it hath pleased the Great and Divine Benefactor, to reveal in Men the Holy Spirit, which is fully sufficient to Baptize true Believers therein into Christ, the glorious Head of the Church of the new Testament, and to make them Partakers of his Divine Nature, in whom all Fullness dwells.

They therefore who are Sharers of this unspeakable Gift, and become united to it, may testify from Experience, that it is Spiritual Baptism, which is the Baptism of Christ; and they who are Baptized therewith, do Feed on him who is the Bread of God. Our Lord in great Condescension, gives such to Taste of his Goodness, and to live by him; here is their Nourishment; this is the Life of their Souls, having been begotten thereby, and Born thereof; they have known what it is to be dipped into the Name of the Lord, and to have their Sins washed away, by the Washing of Regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost; and their Souls hereby are nourished up unto eternal Life. O glorious Baptism! O Heavenly Refreshment! Vertuous and Excellent beyond Expression!

Shall religious Men oppose the Sufficiency of the ONE Baptism, by subjoyning *John's* to it, since in Reality they are TWO distinct Baptisms? shall they subjoin a *Jew-*

The P R E F A C E.

ish Passover, or any Part thereof to this Heavenly Food, Since CHRIST our Passover is Sacrificed for us?

John the Forerunner of our Lord, gave way to him, he being Manifested, said, * *He must Increase, but I must Decrease*; And since he who had divine Authority to Baptize with Water, not only gave way to the Son of God, † but Contradistinguished his Water Baptism, from Christ's spiritual Baptism; how is it that Men who never had a Commission from God to Baptize with Water, can possibly unite an outward Elementary Baptism, with an Inward and Spiritual one.

If any should urge they have a Commission so to Baptize, or yet to join those two together, I shall not believe them, without a Demonstration: For I presume, none in our Time, will assume to themselves a greater Share in the Commission of Christ, *Mat.* 28. 19. than the Apostle *Paul* had; who Speaking of Water Baptism in *1 Cor.* 1. Testifies that Christ sent him not to Baptize but to Preach the Gospel; and who can deny but that he instrumentally Baptized into the Name of the Father, &c. and so fulfilled that Commission, since the Ministry which he received was undeniably a Baptizing Ministry; because thereby many were turned from Darkness to Light, and from the Power of Satan unto God; but neither he, nor any of the Apostles that we Read of, ever endeavoured to make these two distinct Baptisms one.

But that I may not divert the Reader too long, from the Arguments on this Head, contained in the following Sheets, I shall briefly observe, the Substance of my former Preface, to which I refer, remains unanswered by *Joseph Jenks*; yet he hath Insinuated, that Water Baptism, and what he calls the Lord's Supper, were not included in the Prohibition of the Apostle, *Col.* Chap. 2. and takes upon him to admonish me, and *W. W.* not to Preach, or Write, in Vindication of our Principles, untill we can prove those Ordinances, as he calls them, to be in Hand Writing when our Lord Suffered; to which *W. W.* has clearly re-

* *Joh.* 3. 30. † *Mat.* 3. *Joh.* 1.

The P R E F A C E.

plied near the Close of this Book, and thereby in part prevented me: Yet because much depends on understanding the Apostle rightly, in that Chapter, I take the Liberty to read the 8th and 20th Verse, as the Marginal reading hath it, viz. 8th *Beware least any Man spoil you through Philosophy and vain Deceit, after the Traditions of Men, after the ELEMENTS of the World, and not after Christ.* Verse 20. *Wherefore if ye be Dead with Christ, from the ELEMENTS of the World, why as tho' living in the World, are ye subject to Ordinances.* And 21. *Touch not, Tast not, Handle not, all which are to Perish with the Using, &c.* Whence its Evident, Elements of the World are included in this Prohibition, as not being in their Nature agreeable to a spiritual Dispensation. But Water is an Element, and in the Apostles Sense, doth Perish with the Using. Water Baptism, therefore, is an Elementary Baptism, and having been an Ordinance of God to the Jews, before the Suffering of Christ, was a Shadow of some good Thing to come; and being Elementary, as other Jewish washings were, could no more make the Comers thereunto perfect, as pertaining to the Conscience, than any of the rest.

This good Thing, whereof all those Washings or Dippings were but a Shadow, is Christ's spiritual Baptism, which Washes away Sin effectually, and purges the Conscience from dead Works, to serve the living God; conferring on all the Subjects thereof, the great Advantage of the Blood of Christ, and of his Resurrection from the Dead. It is therefore that ONE Baptism Eph. 4. which is to abide in the Church of Christ for ever, and whereby every true believer is Baptized into one Body 1 Cor. 12. that is, its the powerful Substance, whereunto this Shadow, among the rest, yielded, when Jesus Christ blotted out the hand Writing of Ordinances, and took it out of the Way, nailing it to his Cross.

So that it's not whether Water Baptism was an Ordinance in hand Writing, at the Time of Christ's Suffering, but whether it was a Shadow, or not, is the Question? For, if the Ordinances relating to Shadows, that were in hand

The P R E F A C E.

hand Writing were blotted out: How is it possible, that a Shadow that was not in hand Writing, could be of greater Force? Or could in Point of Obligation, remain in a Dispensation, contrary in Nature to the most lively representation, Shadow, or Type? Let *Joseph Jenks*, and the rest of his Brethren seriously consider this; and be careful how they Preach up a Shadow, for an Ordinance of Christ, since God has been pleased to reveal the Spirit of his Son, which is the Substance indeed, Meat and Drink are expressly mentioned in *Col. 2. 16.* and called a Shadow of Things to come in Verse 17. but Bread and Wine are included in these. Is it not therefore highly agreeable to the Nature of the new Covenant, or Dispensation of the Gospel, to assert they are not to be Touched, Tasted, or Handled, as Ordinances of Christ, under such an Heavenly Covenant? let the Wise in Heart Judge.

Was it not the Dispensation of Shadows, which was done away, by the Offering of Christ, or if not, what was it? And if the Dispensation was ended, by that one Offering, how is it that any of the Shadows can remain in an Agreement to that Divine Will, which found fault with the very Covenant, in which, alone, the Ordinances, requiring the Observation of them, were in Force? And is it not most reasonable, that all Shadows should cease, since the Dispensation which, only, made them acceptable to God is ended?

I conceive, the Arguments relating to those matters in Debate, between us and our Opponents, may be comprized in a narrow Compass; for the Things for which they contend (and we disuse) were Shadows of good Things, or they were not. If it be allowed they were such Shadows, the Question is, how can any Man prove them to be agreeable in Nature, to the new Covenant Dispensation, whereby ALL Shadows were abolished? But if it be said they were not, it remains for such who are of that Opinion to prove, either that they are the Heavenly Things themselves, purely spiritual and agreeable to the Dispensation of the Gospel, or give up the Cause, for which they so long, with so much Warmth, contended.

The P R E F A C E.

We say on the other Hand (and let him Deny it, who can prove the contrary) the Baptism of Christ, and Supper of the Lord, are the Heavenly and Spiritual Things, which those Shadows Typified; and we have had engaging Obligations upon us, to Publish to the World, that these are Christ's own Ordinances, agreeable to his own Kingdom which is Spiritual; Ordinances Evangelical, and saving to the uttermost, through Christ our Mediator: For these therefore (yea these in Simplicity) we contend earnestly desiring our Readers, and Hearers, not to Neglect this the Heavenly Substance, in its manifestation within them, while they contend for those Shadows, which we have been taught to disuse; and then we doubt not, but God the Father, by our Lord Jesus Christ, will open their Eyes also, to see the Weakness of all beggarly Elements, in a Church wherein Christ is Head, and Administrator of that living Vertue, which is Sealed by him into all who are united to him, through the Power of that new and heavenly Testament, which he has Triumphant-ly confirmed by his Death, and will for ever support by that eternal Life, which raised him up from the Dead, to the Glory of the Almighty God, to the Edification and Salvation of all his Children.

That thou, Reader, mayest be One of this Number, is the fervent Desire of thy assured Friend,

*London, the 19th
of the second
Month, 1721.*

L. G.

I
I
to
Jer
Ma
the
the
ma
am
ma
Ma
hol
the
rec
goo
cor
yea
Ge
tho
you
fift
wer
aga
the
of t
adm
den
whi
from
thau

T H E INTRODUCTION.

I Would only add, to what my Friend Godfrey hath wrote by Way of Preface, three Things, viz. That what I have wrote in the following Pages, is not with any Prejudice to the Baptists in general, nor yet those with whom Joseph Jenks is joyned in particular, much less to him, either as a Man, or as a Member of that Society. And first, as to the Baptists in general, I am perswaded they have carryed the Reformation from Popery and Superstition, further in many Respects, both in Purity of Doctrine, and also in Example of Life, then divers other Protestant Churches; for many of the Baptists in their first Rise, were both against a Man made Ministry in their Churches, and also against upholding by a stated Maintenance, any such, either amongst themselves or others; but did believe, that as every one had received the Gift, he might Minister it to another, as a good Steward of the Grace of God, which was thus far, according to the Apostles Doctrine: Also many of them were, yea and still are, (Witness the Baptists in Holland and Germany) against all Swearing and Fighting; and so in those Respects, come to the Commands of Christ, I say unto you Swear not at all; and again, I say unto you that ye resist not Evil, &c. In all which, many of the Baptists so far were brought to the Doctrine of Christ; they also were against Sprinkling their Children, and Initiating them into their Churches, by that carnal Ordinance, as is the Practice of the Lutherans, Church of England, and Presbyterians, to admit Members into their Churches, who can give no Evidence or Demonstration of their being Born of the Spirit; which Practice the Baptists very conscientiously dissented from; thus for the Baptists in general. Secondly, as to that Society with whom J. J. is joyned, they mostly hold the

a

free,

Free Grace of God, through Jesus Christ, to be given to all Men to profit withall : They also Practise a free Liberty, for any of their Brethren, to Preach and Exhort as they themselves are come to an honest and sober Life and Conversation, which is much nearer the Primitive Practice of the Church of Christ, than to confine the Preaching of the Gospel to certain Letter learned Men only, as the Generality of Protestants do, to the no small Reproach of the Reformation. Thirdly, as to my Friend Jenks in particular, first as a Man, I have this to say (having been well acquainted with him from my Youth upwards) he is Naturally of a good affable free Disposition, and very pleasant and kind in his Conversation, which hath made his Company always very Desirable, and Acceptable to me ; and notwithstanding our Difference in Judgment, in many Things concerning Religion ; yet we always had a mutual Respect for each other, which he manifested afresh (since the following Sheets were wrote) in his late Voyage to London, which I take to be really commendable in him ; for I think Religion should never sour Men's Dispositions, but at least keep them as good as it finds them, &c. And as to his being a Member of the Baptists Society at Providence, in the Colony of Rhode Island in New England, the Place of his, and my Nativity ; I am far from bearing him any ill will on that Account : For being in my Judgment for a universal Liberty of Conscience in Matters of Religion, I can by no means, envy any for differing from me therein, but would have every one from good Grounds, be fully perswaded in his own Mind. And yet tho' I bear no Prejudice, in any respect to Joseph Jenks, but truly love him ; yet he having in his Book I have now Answered asserted, That Water Baptism, and what he calls the Lord's Supper, are Ordinances of Christ, and to continue in his Church 'till his second Coming, (by which he means the End of the World) and that the Arguments I advanced (in Answer to John Hammett's Book) to prove the Baptism of the Holy Spirit without Elementary Water, is the Baptism of Christ, are fairly refuted ; and Water Baptism and the Lord's Supper plainly proved to be the Command of Christ, &c. I say considering these and many more of his Assertions

Assertions, to be against the Doctrine of Christ and his Apo-
 stles, in asserting Water Baptism and the Passover, by him
 miscalled the Lord's Supper, for Commands of Christ; which
 at most were Commands of God under the Law and Types
 of the inward and Soul cleansing Baptism of Christ, and of
 his feeding his People himself, who is the true Bread of
 Life, and therefore were not to remain under the Gospel of
 Christ, who is the Substance and Antitype of all the Types
 under the Law; for which Cause, I found my self under
 deep Obligations to Answer J. Jenks Book, (notwithstand-
 ing our mutual Friendship) and so much the more, in as
 much as his publick Station in the World, as a Magistrate,
 many Years, and now Deputy Governour of Rhoad Island,
 hath raised his Fame, and thereby many (it is probable)
 have been induced to read his Book, who never saw either
 J. Hammett's, or mine; who perhaps may now do me that
 Justice, as to Read this Answer of mine to his, and there-
 by give themselves the Opportunity of seeing how fully I
 clear my self, and former Arguments, from J. J's. pre-
 tended Refutation of them; and also how plainly, from
 clear Scripture Testimony, I manifest that the Baptism of
 the Holy Spirit, without Elementary Water, is the Baptism
 of Christ. And friendly Reader, I only add farther, that
 tho' I found it my Duty to Answer J. J's Book, the more
 because of the good Character he bears amongst Men,
 lest any without duly considering what he Writes,
 should from thence take what he says on his Credit,
 and not search for themselves. But if he should Write again,
 unless he advance some new Arguments from Scripture,
 which neither he, nor J. Hammett have yet advanced; I
 may not think my self obliged to Answer him again, tho'
 there should be some undue Reflections on me, as there were
 in his last, which I can easily bear for Christ's sake, but if
 any other Baptist of an inferior Character to J. J. should
 Answer what I now Write, without bringing some new Scrip-
 ture Arguments, and clear Demonstrations, that Water
 Baptism, and that they call the Lord's Supper, are Ordinan-
 ces of Christ, (which I am perswaded can never be done) I
 shall not hold my self any way obliged to Answer them, but
 now

now may refer the Reader, to this and my former Book ; as my settled Judgment against the Arguments which I have yet seen in Vindication of Water Baptism and that called the Lord's Supper, as being the Commands of Christ : And now friendly Reader, in much Sincerity, I recommend thee to the Grace of God, come by Jesus Christ, that under the Influence thereof, thou mayest Read what I have Written that thou mayest be able to make a right Judgment therein is the Earnest desire of thy Souls Well-wisher,

*London, the 20th
of the second
Month, 1721.*

WILLIAM WILKINSON

An ANSWER to *Joseph Jenks's*
Reply to *William Wilkinson's*
TREATISE, &c.

Joseph Jenks, in the first Page of his Book, quotes the Fifth of mine, thus. ' *John's* Baptism was under the Dispensation of the Law; for CHRIST, and not *John*, is the End of the Law, &c. See *Rom. 10. 4.* neither did CHRIST put an end to the Law of Commandments contained in Ordinances, until he was offer'd up a Sacrifice once for all; and *John* having finished his Course before that Time, it from thence appears his whole Dispensation of Water Baptism was Legal.

" He Replies, if *W. W. intends* by Legal (as he must if he speaks proper) that *John's* Baptism was Part of the *Mosaical* or *Levitical* Law, which he endeavours to persuade his Reader to believe; then it must have been manifest to all *Israel*, for so was the *Mosaical* Law; then I desire him to cite the Scripture where it is so declared, which if he cannot do, then he is the Man not to be trusted in his Exposition of Scripture.

Answer. I did (and still do) mean that *John's* Dispensation of Water Baptism, was under the Law of *Moses* or old Testament, and not under the new Testament, which was of no Force 'till CHRIST the Testator died, according to *Heb. 9. 17.* And as for his desiring me to cite the Scripture where it is declared to be made manifest to all *Israel*, I may inform him and my Readers also, that it was made manifest to the Inhabitants of *Judea* and *Jerusalem*, and also to all *Israel* from the following Texts, *Mat. 3. 5, 6.* Then went out to him *Jerusalem* and all *Judea*, and the Region round about *Jordan*, and were Baptized of him in *Jordan*, *Luk. 3. 15, 16.* And as the People were in Expectation,

and all Men mused in their Hearts of *John*, whether he was the **CHRIST**, or no, *John* answer'd, saying unto THEM ALL, *I indeed Baptize you with Water, &c.* from whence 'tis plain it was manifest to them all, or else they all could not have mused in their Hearts, nor could he have answer'd to them all what his Baptism was, without thereby manifesting his Baptism to them. *Acts* 13. 24. when *John* had first Preach'd before his, *i. e.* **CHRIST**'s coming, the Baptism of Repentance to all the People of *Israel*: So that from these Premises, I hope I may be trusted in the Exposition of Scriptures, for the same End for which they were wrote.

“ *J. J.* in his *p.* 2. having cited my Book *p.* 4. observes, that by my Manner of Reasoning, if it (*i. e.* *John*'s Baptism) was manifest to them, (*i. e.* those under the Law) they were to be Baptized, &c.

Ans. What I intended by saying in *p.* 4. that all those under the Law of *Moses*, (so far as it was manifest to them) were to submit to Water Baptism, as the Counsel and Command of God, was, that as *John* was sent from **GOD**, according to *Joh.* 1. 6. so those he was sent to, *viz.* all the People of *Israel*, to whom he Preach'd the Baptism of Repentance, *Acts* 13. 24. were to be Baptized in Water, or else reject the Counsel of **GOD** against themselves, as the *Pharisees* did *Luk.* 7. 30. Yet I conceive it was no way unsafe in me, to put in with a Parenthesis, so far as it was made manifest to them; for there was no doubt some Deaf, and some other ways uncapable, without any Fault of their own, to hear *John*'s Doctrine, and be informed of his Baptism: And in such, it was not a rejecting the Counsel of **GOD**, because where no Law is manifest, there is no Transgression, which in my Opinion is agreeable to, *Rom.* 4. 15. In *p.* 2, 3. *J. J.* quotes *Mat.* 3. 7, 8, 9. where *John* exhorted the *Pharisees* and *Sadducees* that came to his Baptism, to bring forth Fruits meet for Repentance; and then goes on thus, in *p.* 3. “ Whence I observe, that neither the *Pharisees* nor *Sadducees* were in-
“ righted to this Ordinance of Water Baptism, as being
“ Children of *Abraham*, as they were to all the Ordinances

ces and Privileges of the Law, which plainly shews, that this Ordinance of Water Baptism pertained to another Dispensation distinct from that of the Law; and that none had right to it any other ways than by Repentance and Faith.

Ans. But it is manifest, notwithstanding what my Friend *Jenks* says to the contrary, that the Children of *Abraham* according to the Flesh, were not inrighted to all the Ordinances of the Law when they were gone into Wickedness as these *Pharisees* were; is clear from the following Scriptures, *Isa.* 1. 13, 14. *Bring no more vain Oblations, Incense is an Abomination unto me; the new Moons and Sabbaths, the Calling of Assemblies, I cannot away with, it's Iniquity, even the solemn Meeting, your new Moons, and your appointed Feasts my Soul hateth.* &c. And the Reason follows in the next Verses; Their Hands were full of Blood; but on Terms of their ceasing to do Evil, and Learning to do well, (which includes in it both Faith and Repentance) they had the Promise of eating the Good of the Land, &c. From whence it is clear, that until they came from Evil doing to Well doing, they were forbid performing those Ordinances which were commanded in the Law. But the *Pharisees* and *Sadduces* were not denied to be Baptized, but exhorted to bring forth Fruits meet for Repentance, &c. and again, *Isa.* 66. 3. *He that killeth an Ox is as if he Slew a Man, he that Sacrificeth a Lamb, as if he cut off a Dogs Neck, he that offereth an Oblation, as if he offer'd Swines Blood, he that burneth Incense as if he blessed an Idol.* From all which it plainly follows, that they were not inrighted, to use his own Words, to the Ordinances of the Law commanded to *Israel*, except they amended their ways by Repentance: And therefore if my Friend *Jenks* will have it, that the *Pharisees* and *Sadduces* were not inrighted to Water Baptism as being Children of *Abraham*, except they came to Repentance and Faith; yet that will not demonstrate that Water Baptism appertained to another Dispensation distinct from that of the Law, seeing as is before proved, the wicked tho' Children of *Abraham*, were more strictly forbid the Ordinances

that *Moses* commanded, than these were the Baptism of *John*, tho' they were all under one Dispensation. But *J. J.* having cited my Book Page 5. where I argued, that *John* being dead (before CHRIST the Testator confirmed the new Testament by his own Death) was a clear manifestation that *John's* Baptism was under the old Law or Testament, and not under the new: To which *J. J.* replies in Page 3. 4. " It is evident by *W. W's.* manner of Reasoning, that he would insinuate to his unwary Reader, that because *John* was dead before CHRIST Suffer'd, that therefore his Doctrine and Baptism could be no Part of the Gospel, or new Testament. But let the Reader consider, that if such Reasoning will hold good, then all the Doctrine, Miracles, and Commands of CHRIST, before his Suffering, could be no Part of the Gospel and new Testament.

Ans. Tho' I have manifested in my former Book, and this also, that *John's* Baptism (which had no Command, neither from *John*, nor yet from CHRIST, to continue after *John* was Dead) was no Part of the new Testament or Gospel Dispensation: Yet it will not from thence follow, that the Doctrines and Commands of CHRIST, which he Preach'd before he Suffer'd, were no Part of the Gospel or new Testament Dispensation; seeing the Doctrines and Commands of CHRIST were what he commanded his Disciples to Teach, after his Resurrection, (when the Dispensation of the Gospel, or new Covenant fully took Place) as appears from *Mat*, 28. and 20. where he saith, Teaching them to observe whatsoever I have commanded you, &c. But for *John's* Baptism, neither CHRIST nor *John* ever commanded it to be taught or practised after *John* the Administrator of it was Dead. In Page 5. *J. J.* goes on, in order to prove that CHRIST proceeded in the same Way of Baptizing as *John* had begun, and for Proof thereof, quotes *John* 3. 22. thus, ' after these Things, came JESUS and his Disciples into the Land of Judea, and there he tarried with them and Baptized. ' " So that if he were not personally the Administrator of it, yet it must be done by his Authority and Command

“ Command, and that this was Water Baptism is also clear &c.

Ans. Here my Friend *Jenks*, seems to have a Side Blow at the Evangelist, as well as the *Quakers*, by saying, if he, (*i. e.* JESUS) was not Personally the Administrator of it, tho' he may Read what the same Evangelist saith in *Chap. 4. 2.* that JESUS himself Baptized not but his Disciples; and *John* knowing what he had said in *Chap. 3. 22.* and therefore least any should think from thence, that JESUS, either in his own Person, or by any Command to his Disciples, did Baptize any in, or with Water; therefore to clear it himself, saith in *Chap. 4. 2.* that JESUS himself Baptized not, but his Disciples: From whence it is clear, he neither did it Personally, nor by his Disciples; for what a Man doth by exprefs Command to those under him (as the Disciples were under CHRIST) he may be said to do it, as *Solomon* is said to have built the Temple, &c. And therefore, *Joh. 3. 22.* may be read thus, *After these Things came JESUS and his Disciples into the Land of Judea, and there he tarried with them, and the Disciples Baptized, but JESUS himself Baptized not*, as is before manifested. But to let my Friend *Jenks* see, that according to his Argument, the Disciples Baptizing with Water before CHRIST was Offered up, was with *John's* Baptism, and not with CHRIST'S, is clear from what follows. First, *J. J.* lays down in Page 23. the Form of Words used by *John*, in the Administration of Baptism thus, “ He, (*i. e.* CHRIST) alters the Form of Words used by *John*, in the Administration of Baptism, which was by telling the People they must believe in him which should come after him. ” And this Form according to him, lasted 'till CHRIST gave his Disciples that Command, *Mat. 28. 19.* After his Resurrection, as may be fairly argued from his Page 23. thus, “ And CHRIST having now (after his Resurrection, as may be seen in the Top of the same Page) all Power both in Heaven and Earth, he alters the Form of Words used by *John*, in the Administration of Baptism. ” And in Page 26. 27. he saith,

“for Apollos, though he was Baptized with the Baptism of *John*, yet it being Administred before CHRIST Suffered, and had changed the Form of Words as aforesaid — when CHRIST was already come and suffered Death and was risen again, and had by his Command given to his Disciples, changed that Form of Words used by *John*.

From which I would observe, *First*, that *John's* Form of Words in the Administration of Water Baptism, according to *J. J.* was by telling the People they must believe in him who should come after him. *Secondly*, that this Form of Words, according to him, lasted 'till CHRIST altered it after his Resurrection; from whence it is clear, that CHRIST neither Baptized in his own Person, nor by his Command to his Disciples; for it cannot be imagined without great Absurdity, that he would either in his own Person, or by his Disciples, tell the People they must believe in him who should come after HIM, when he the true MESSIAS was already come that they might have Life, and have it more abundantly. Therefore the Disciples Baptizing with Water, and using *John's* Form of Words, it must be *John's* Baptism, as *J. J.* calls it in Page 26. saying, Apollos tho' Baptized with the Baptism of *John*, &c. So that he allowing *John* had a Baptism with Water, and a Form of Words peculiar to his Baptism, which Form lasted till after CHRIST Suffered, it follows, that it was *John's* Baptism and not CHRIST's, which the Disciples used before CHRIST Suffered. But *J. J.* proceeds in Page 5. thus, “and this Water Baptism, though sometimes, “called *John's*, was properly CHRIST's, both by his “Institution and Use of it, as the Doctrine (sometimes) “called the Apostles Doctrine was his.

Ans. No, it was never called CHRIST's Baptism, nor did CHRIST ever use it, but both he and also the Apostle Paul, called it *John's*, See *Mar. II. 30.* compared with *Acts I. 5.* thus, *The Baptism of John, was it from Heaven or of Men?* for *John* truly Baptized with Water, &c. *Acts 19. 4.* Then said Paul, *John verily Baptized*

tized

Ba p
 is t
 fore-
 fered
 mand
 words
 Form
 , ac-
 t be-
 that
 'till
 nence
 own
 can-
 would
 Peo-
 after
 come
 abun-
 Water,
 Bap-
 tho'
 he al-
 rm of
 ill af-
 John's
 used
 Page
 times,
 y his
 times)
 otism,
 so the
 ompa-
 was it
 l with
 y Bap-
 tized

ized with the Baptism of Repentance, and this Baptism of Repentance was that with Water, as is clear from *John's* own Words, *Mat. 3. 11.* thus, *I indeed Baptize you with Water unto Repentance, &c.* from all which, it appears Water Baptism was called *John's*, to distinguish it from *CHRISTS*, whose was, and is, with the *HOLY-GHOST* and with Fire, See *Mat. 3. 11.* In Page 6. *J. J.* having quoted my Book in Page 5, 6. where I argued against *John's* Baptism, being the Beginning of the Gospel of *JESUS CHRIST*, replys to it thus in Page 6. "It is certain that the Evangelist *Mark*, doth declare those Words, viz. *The Beginning of the Gospel of JESUS CHRIST*; and for as much as they cannot relate to any matter precedent to them, they must unavoidably have relation to some Thing subsequent to be applyed to, or else his Words must be an Impertinence and stand for Cyphers, as *W. W.* would perswade his Reader they do.

Ans^w. I never offered one Word to my Reader, or any body else, to perswade them that *Mark's* Words stood for Cyphers, nor yet ever thought so, 'tho' my Friend *Jenks*, hath positively asserted it. But what I wrote in answer to *J. H.* calling *John's* Baptism the Beginning of the Gospel of *JESUS CHRIST*, was plainly to demonstrate that those Words of *Mark*, (*i. e.* the Beginning of the Gospel of *JESUS CHRIST*) did not relate to *John's* Baptism; which I thought I had so fully done, that none would have ventured to oppose it; but I find my Friend *Jenks* hath, tho' to little purpose. But tho' I did not in my Answer to *J. H.* shew what *Mark's* Words (*i. e.* the Beginning of the Gospel of *JESUS CHRIST*) related to, yet now I shall as followeth. *First*, let it be considered, that it is not uncommon for Authors, in the Beginning of their Works, concisely to mention what they intend to treat off; and this I conceive was the Case of the Evangelist; who being about to Write of the Gospel, or new Testament dispensation which *CHRIST* Preached, he begins thus. *The Beginning of the Gospel of JESUS CHRIST the Son of God*: And to introduce the manner

Now CHRIST began to Preach, he says, as it is written in the Prophets, *Behold I send my Messenger before THY FACE, which shall prepare THY WAY BEFORE THEE*; and then relates what John the Baptist did in the Wilderness, as his Messenger, before he relates the Beginning of the Gospel which CHRIST Preached, which in Verses 14, 15. he doth thus. *Now after John was put in Prison, JESUS came into Galilee, preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom of God, (i. e. the new Testament dispensation which he confirmed by his own Death) saying, the Time is fulfilled and the Kingdom of God is at Hand, Repent ye and believe the Gospel.* Observe Reader, that it was after, (and not before) John was cast into Prison; CHRIST said the Time was fulfilled that they should Repent and believe the Gospel which he Preached; which evidences that John's Baptism was not the Beginning of the Gospel of JESUS CHRIST; seeing he was cast into Prison before the Time was fulfilled (as CHRIST said) for their believing the Gospel of the Kingdom or new Testament Dispensation; but if John's Baptism had been the Beginning of the Gospel of JESUS CHRIST, as both J. H. in Page 23. and J. J. in Page 7. say; then CHRIST had no need to have said, Repent and receive the Gospel, for all the Land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem went out to John and were all Baptized of him in the River Jordan, See Mark 1. 5. And so consequently had received the Gospel, if John's Baptism had been it, which is very absurd, as is fully Manifest from what is already said. But J. J. goes on in Page 7. thus, "Indeed notwithstanding all that W. W. has, or can say against it, all true Believers may fairly concede to the Evangelist's calling John's Baptism and Doctrine, the Beginning of the Gospel of JESUS CHRIST; for it was undoubtedly glad Tidings (as the word Gospel signifies) and the Beginning of such glad Tidings too (to true penitent Sinners) to receive Remission of their Sins by true Repentance and believing in a CHRIST to come, and being Baptized in Water; all which, John's Doctrine both exhorted and directed unto.

Answer

Ans. Tho' *John's* Doctrine in a Sense may be said to be glad Tidings, (as the Word Gospel signifies) yet it was no more so, than the Preachings and Writings of many before him, who were likewise under the Law; and therefore not as *J. J.* says, the Beginning of such glad Tidings too: For did not *Jeremiah* preach glad Tidings, when he said *Jer. 4. 14. O Jerusalem, wash thine Heart from Wickedness, that thou mayest be saved, &c.* And *Isaiah*, when he said *Isa. 1. 16, 17, 18. Wash you, make you Clean, put away the Evil of your doings from before mine Eyes; cease to do Evil, learn to do Well, seek Judgment, relieve the Oppressed, judge the Fatherless, plead for the Widow; come now and let us reason together, saith the LORD; though your Sins be as Scarlet, they shall be as white as Snow; though they be red like Crimson, they shall be as Wool.*- And did not the Angels preach glad Tidings to the Shepherds, *Luk. 2. 10, 11. Fear not; for behold I bring you glad Tidings of great Joy, which shall be to all People; for unto you is Born this Day, in the City of David a Saviour, which is CHRIST the LORD.* And did not *Simeon* preach glad Tidings in the Temple, when he took up the Child *JESUS* in his Arms, *Luk. 2. 28, 29, 30, 31, 32.* and said, Lord, now lettest thou thy Servant depart in Peace, according to thy Word, for mine Eyes have seen thy Salvation, which thou hast prepared before the Face of all People; a light to lighten the Gentiles, and the Glory of thy People Israel. And was not the Gospel preached to *Abraham*, according to the saying of the Apostle, *Gal. 3. 8. And the Scripture foreseeing that God would justify the Heathen through Faith, preached before the Gospel unto Abraham, &c.* From whence it appears that many before *John*, preached glad Tidings, and had glad Tidings preached to them; and yet neither their Preaching, nor *John's*, much less his Baptism, (tho' all good in their Time and Season) were the Beginning of the Gospel of *JESUS CHRIST*, as the Dispensation of the new Covenant and Testament, that *CHRIST* confirmed by his Death; for that was reserved for the Son, as himself intimated, when having cited the Prophet's

Ans.

phet's Words, *Isa. 61. 1.* as we have it in *Luk. 4. 18, 19, 21, 22.* *The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the Poor, he hath sent me to heal the broken Hearted, to preach deliverance to the Captives, and recovering of Sight to the Blind, to set at Liberty them that are Bruised, to preach the acceptable Year of the Lord: And he began to say unto them, this Day is this Scripture fulfilled in your Ears; and all bare him Witness, and wondered at the gracious Words which proceeded out of his Mouth.* In Page 8, 9. *J. J.* having quoted my Book Page 12. where I was arguing that *John's* Baptism was not to continue in the Church of CHRIST, from his own Words, *Joh. 3. 30.* there speaking of CHRIST, he saith, *He must Increase, but I must Decrease;* now I hope it will readily be granted, that *John* spoke this either of themselves, or of their Dispensations and Baptisms, to which *J. J.* replies in Page 9. "*John* undeniably speaks this, as both CHRIST and himself were Lights, and both to give Light for one End and Purpose, yet the one far exceeding the other.

Ans. w. That *John* saying CHRIST must increase, but himself decrease, was in Respect of their being Lights, &c. I deny; for the Information that was given to *John*, upon which he declared that CHRIST must Increase, but he Decrease, was not that CHRIST was a greater Light than he, (tho' to be sure he was, and is) but it was upon his being informed, *Joh. 3. 26.* that he that was with him beyond *Jordan*, (i. e. CHRIST) to whom he bore Witness, that he Baptizeth, and all Men come to him; upon which *John* answers, Verse 27, 28, 29, 30. saying, *A Man can receive nothing, except it be given him from Heaven; ye your selves bear me Witness, that I said I am not the CHRIST, but that I am sent before him: he that hath the Bride is the Bridegroom; but the Friend of the Bridegroom, which standeth and beareth him, rejoiceth greatly, because of the Bridegrooms Voice; this my Joy is therefore fulfilled: He must Increase, but I must Decrease, &c.* From whence it is manifest, it was upon *John's* hearing

4. 18. ing that CHRIST Baptized, and that all Men came to
 use the m, that he said CHRIST *must Increase, and himself*
 poor, be *decrease*; from whence it follows, he had respect to the
 deliver Baptisms, and wherein the Difference of their Baptisms lay
 Blind, John had before described in *Mat. 3. 11.* when he said,
 the ac indeed Baptize you with Water unto Repentance; but he
 o them, hat cometh after me is mightier than I, whose Shoes I am
 and all not worthy to bear; he shall Baptize you with the Holy
 Words Ghost and Fire. In Page 10. *J. J.* having quoted my
J. J. Book Page 13. where I argued from what appeared to the
 arguing Disciples in the Holy Mount, when they were for ma-
 urch of king three Tabernacles, one for CHRIST, one for *Mo-*
 there ses, and one for *Elias*; but to shew them it must not be so,
 se, but the LORD, while *Peter* yet spake, caused a bright Cloud
 ranted, to overshadow them, and they were sore afraid, and fell
 their on their Faces, but when they lifted up their Eyes they
 replies saw no Man save JESUS only. From whence I observed,
 s both that *Moses* with his Ceremonies was departed, and *Elias*
 to give or *John*, with his Water Baptism was departed; but
 exceed- CHRIST, who by thoroughly purging the Floor, takes
 away the Sins of the World; he remained, whom (and
 se, but not *John*) they were admonished to hear. To which
 Lights, *J. J.* replies in Page 10. thus, " Here *W. W.* seems to
 John, make some distinction between the legal Ceremonies,
 crease, and Water Baptism; but sometimes he makes them to
 a grea- be one; and here also by what he says, they were both
 is) but vanished away; But sometimes he will allow them to
 be that continue till CHRIST's suffering; but it's no wonder
 o whom that Weapons formed against CHRIST's Ordinances
 come to should Clash.

29, 30. *Ans. First*, there might be some Distinction, (and
 en him really was) betwixt *Moses* with his legal Ceremonies (for
 I said these are my Words) and *John's* Water Baptism, and
 im: be yet they both under the legal Dispensation; for tho' the
 end of Prophets before CHRIST came, (of which *John* was
 joyceth one) were under the Dispensation of the Law, yet they
 Joy is were distinguished, *Mat. 11. 13.* by CHRIST himself
 crease, thus, *For all the Prophets, and the Law, prophesied until*
 r hear- John. Secondly, as to my having them (*i. e. Moses's Ce-*
 ing remonies

remories, and *John's* Water Baptism) both to vanish away; yet says he, sometimes *W. W.* will allow them to continue till CHRIST's Suffering, &c. Reply tho' it was intimated to the Disciples, by what they then saw and heard, that *Moses* with his Ceremonies, and *John* with his Water Baptism must depart, and CHRIST only remain in the Gospel Dispensation; yet it no way follows, that the Dispensation of the Law was ended until CHRIST suffered and confirmed the new Testament by his own Death. But, *Thirdly*, I deny that any of my Arguments, or Weapons, as he terms them, were formed against CHRIST's Ordinances, or that they clash; for Water Baptism was never an Ordinance of CHRIST, or called so by CHRIST, or any of his Disciples, nor yet by any other, until Men apostatize from true Christianity. But *J. J.* goes on in Page 10, 11, 12. "but he (*i. e. W. W.*) hath taken a great deal of Pains to prove, that this *Elias* which appeared on the Mount, was *John the Baptist*, and hath erected a large Building upon that Foundation; but if the Foundation fail (as I think it will) his Building must fall. But the Text makes it clear they (*i. e. the Disciples*) did not know it, until CHRIST had resolved their Question; and therefore it is evident, that the *Elias* which they saw upon the Mount, was not *John the Baptist*, but *Elias the Prophet*; and therefore all *W. W.*'s vaunting Arguments, grounded upon this *Elias* being *John the Baptist*, must down as aforesaid.

Ans. But if the Foundation on which I built my Argument, which is the Doctrine of CHRIST and his Apostles, as they are recorded in the Scriptures of the new Testament, should stand, then the Building raised thereon will stand also; and that this *Elias* which appeared on the Mount was *John the Baptist*, is clear from *Mat.* 17. 10, 11, 12, 13. for upon this, *Elias* having appeared with *Moses* on the Mount, they asked Jesus as they came down from the Mountain, why say the Scribes that *Elias* must first come? And Jesus answered and said unto them, *Elias* truly shall first come, and restore all Things

vanish I say unto you, that Elias is come already, and they
 hem t new him not, but have done unto him whatever they listed :
 tho' when the Disciples understood that he spake to them of John
 en fav the Baptist. From whence it appears, that from their ha-
 1 Joh ving seen this Elias on the Mount, they asked the Question,
 R I S why the Scribes said Elias must first come; and upon their
 o way question he answered them, that Elias was already come,
 ded un and they understood he spake to them of John the Baptist, so
 Testa that if I am mistaken I have good Company : And what if
 at an the Disciples did not know that this Elias was John the
 , wen Baptist, till CHRIST informed them as he came down
 t the from the Mountain; that don't make it Evident that it was
 nce of not John the Baptist, but rather confirms it was; and there-
 of h fore (not my Vaunting, but Scripture Arguments, ground-
 tatize ed upon this Elias's being John the Baptist) instead of com-
 age 10 ing down, as J. J. vainly imagines, stands firm and un-
 at de moveable, notwithstanding all J. J. hath said against it.

“ In Page 13. J. J. says, by what W. W. has asserted,
 erec the Baptism which CHRIST commanded his Disci-
 if th ples to Administer, *Mat.* 28. 19. was the Baptism of
 g mul the Holy Ghost, and that it was to be administred
 e Dis by Teaching, and that the Teaching and Baptizing
 l resol must be one entire Act, and not be separated, for this
 , tha is the plain Import of his Argument; and that
 as no the Disciples had Power to Baptize, he endeavours to
 crefor prove, but how well he has accomplished it I shall
 n thi leave to the Readers Judgment.

Ans. That the Baptism commanded, *Mat.* 28. 19.
 ny An was CHRIST's own Baptism, which was that of the
 nd hi Holy Ghost, appears to me plain, in that it was to
 of th be Administred to all Nations, by Virtue of his Com-
 raise mand. But so was not John's Baptism of Water, and
 appear that it was to be performed by the Disciples, is also clear,
 n Mat they having Power when the Holy Ghost was come upon
 appear them, to perform what he commanded them, which was
 as the to teach all Nations, Baptizing them in, (or rather into
 es tha as the Greek hath it) the Name of the FATHER, and
 d unt of the SON and of the HOLY GHOST: Thus when
 things they themselves were endowed with Power from on High,
 Bu (which

(which they were expressly commanded to wait for) *Luk* 24. 49. then they having CHRIST with and in them according to *Joh*. 14. 17. 20. yea the Father and the Son to make their abode with them, Verse 23d. they then were made able Ministers of the new Testament, and the Works which CHRIST had done, they had his Promise they should do also, and greater Works than those he had done while he was yet with them, which no doubt related to the Teaching or Discipling all Nations, Baptizing them into the Name of the FATHER SON and HOLY GHOST; thus were they qualified by CHRIST who wrought effectually in *Peter*, and was mighty in *Paul*, according to *Gal*. 2. 8. so that it was from the Power of CHRIST which was with them, whilst they were Teaching, that they did instrumentally Baptize with the HOLY GHOST, those who received their Testimony, as it came in Power and in much Assurance, by such Ministers; many were turned from Darkness unto Light and from *Satan's* Power to GOD, where let me leave them and my Reader also, while I observe my Friend *J. J.* in Page 13. citing my Book Page 18. thus, " but " to prove that the Disciples, as Ministers and Instruments, did really so Teach and do, as to Baptize with the HOLY GHOST; take the Proof from *Acts* 8. 17, 18. *Then laid they their Hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost.* To this *J. J.* replies, I think the Reader must be very Blind indeed, which cannot see how short *W. W.* falls, of proving what he hath with Confidence asserted, viz. that Teaching and Baptizing which the LORD commanded, *Mat*. 28. was one Act, and not to be separated; when as the very first Text he brings to prove it, is flat against it.

Ans. First, *J. J.* hath not rightly quoted my Words, for whereas he says I say, to prove the Disciples did so Teach and do, as to Baptize with the HOLY GHOST, take the Proof from *Acts* 8. 17, 18. whereas I don't say take the Proof but Proofs; neither did I say take the Proofs from *Acts* 8. 18. &c. but from Scripture, and then quoted *Acts* 8. 17, 18. and *Chap*. 10

) *Luc. 24. 47. and 11. 15, 16. and 9. 17, 18. and 22. 16. and 19.*
 them but whether my Friend *Jenks*, thought if he quoted
the Same right, he could not answer his Design, therefore
 n were could make me say what I never did, or what else could
 nd th his Motive I shall not determine, but only say, it was
 s Pro very disingenuous. *Secondly*, as to his thinking the Rea-
 n thos er must be very Blind, indeed *who cannot see how*
 doub ort I am of proving, what I have with Confidence asserted,
 s, Bap c. Answer, If *J. J.* don't, by partially quoting my
 N an Words, prevent my Reader from reading all my Proofs;
 RIST doubt not but he will be satisfied that I have fully pro-
 ighty ived what I have asserted, viz. that the Disciples as Mi-
 n tha nisters and Instruments, did really so Teach and do, as to
 ft the Baptize with the HOLY GHOST. *Thirdly*, as to
 e wit is making the very first Text I bring to be flat against
 estimo me, I deny it is in any respect against me, for I said in my
 y such ook Page 18. but to prove that the Disciples did really
 Ligh o Teach and do, as to Baptize with the Holy Ghost, take
 e leav the Proofs from Scripture, quoting *Acts 8. 17, 18.* which
 Friend ainly prove they did lay their Hands on them, and
 " bu they received the HOLY GHOST; and when Simon
 Instru law that through laying on the Apostles Hands the Holy
 e with Ghost was given, which was the Baptism of the HOLY
 Acts 8 GHOST, he offered them Money, &c. from whence it
 d the s clear, the first Text I brought was directly for my pur-
 I thin pose. But *J. J.* goes on in Page the 14. thus, " and
 cannot again if the Baptism commanded in *Mat. 28.* were one
 e hat entire Act with the Teaching, (as *W. W.* hath affirmed)
 d Bap and was the Baptism of the HOLY GHOST, then
 8. wa it unavoidably follows, that *Philip's* Preaching was not
 e ver according to CHRIST's Command, *Mat. 28.* for
 ed m the Samaritans were not Baptized with the HOLY
 sciple GHOST by his Teaching, nor yet by any other
 OL Y means, till a considerable Time after.
 herea Answ. That the Baptism commanded, *Mat. 28.* was
 d I say s plain from the Command it self, in Verse 19. thus, *go*
 Scrip ve therefore teach all Nations, Baptizing them in, (or ra-
 ap. 10 ther into) the Name of the Father, &c. From whence it is
 4. and clear,

clear, that CHRIST who commanded that Baptism joyned it with Teaching, and what he hath joyned together let not Man put asunder: But it doth not follow from thence, that *Philip's* Teaching was not according to that Command, *Mat. 28.* because the *Samaritans* were not Baptized with the HOLY GHOST by his Preaching; for tho' the Gospel Ministry, (which *Philip* and the other Disciples Preached) was a Baptizing Ministry, and was performed in the Evidence and Demonstration of the HOLY SPIRIT, yet it don't from thence follow that all they to whom they Preached were Baptized by their Preaching, any more than that all the *Gentiles* to whom *Paul* Preached were turned from Darknes to Light and from the Power of *Satan* to God; for tho' that was the Command of CHRIST to *Paul*, *Acts 26. 17, 18.* yet many of the *Gentiles* where he came and Preached continued in their Darknes, and cried out, *great is Diana of the Ephesians &c.* Neither doth it follow, that tho' *Philip's* Preaching was a Baptizing Ministry, that therefore as soon as he Preached to the *Samaritans* they must be Baptized, for this they only Experienced as they came to be turned from the Darknes they had been in, to CHRIST the Light and Power of GOD in them, and that it was thus with the *Samaritans* I think is clear, from *Acts 8. 5. 6. 8. 12.* for upon *Philip's* Preaching CHRIST to them, *they with one accord gave heed to those Things which he spake, hearing and seeing the Miracles which he did; And there was great Joy in that City;* because they thereby saw beyond the Sorceries of *Simon* who had bewicht them, from the least to the greatest, which occasioned them to say *he was the great Power of God:* But upon their believing *Philip*, when he Preached the Things concerning the Kingdom of GOD, and the Name of JESUS CHRIST, they were Baptized, &c. From whence I observe, that on *Philip's* Working of Miracles, *they gave heed to those Things that he spake, and believed what he Preached;* and this was a good Beginning and attended with a further Blessing from GOD, through the Ministry of the Apostles; yea, such an one

Baptism is to be Baptized by them with the HOLY GHOST,
 as appears by what follows; for upon the Apostles hear-
 ing they had received the Word of GOD, or Doctrine of
 the Gospel, they sent unto them *Peter and John*, who
 when they came and prayed for them, that they might
 receive the HOLY GHOST; and no doubt in their
 Prayer they Taught them, for the Prayers, as well as
 Preaching, of the Apostles, were both Teaching and Bap-
 tizing, as appears from that Prayer, *Acts 4. 24. to 31.*
where they lift up their Voice to God with one accord, say-
ing, Lord thou art God, which hast made Heaven and Earth,
and the Sea, and all that in them is; who by the Mouth of
thy Servant David hast said, why did the Heathen Rage,
and the People imagine vain Things? The Kings of the
Earth stood up, and the Rulers were gathered together
against the Lord, and against his Christ: For of a Truth
against thy holy Child Jesus whom thou hast Anointed, both
Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the People
of Israel were gathered together, to do whatsoever thy Hand
and thy Counsel determined before to be done: And now,
Lord, behold their Threatnings, and grant unto thy Servants,
that with all Boldness they may speak thy Word, by stretch-
ing forth thine Hand to heal, and that Signs and Wonders
may be done by the Name of thy Holy Child Jesus. And
when they had Prayed, the Place was shaken where they
were Assembled together; and they were all filled with the
Holy Ghost, and they spake the Word of God with Boldness;
&c. Likewise, when *Peter and John* had Prayed, they
 laid their Hands on them, (*i. e.* the Samaritans) and
 they received the Holy Ghost. Thus it may be observed,
 that by degrees they were turned from that bewitched
 State they had been in; and that by the Ministry of *Phi-*
lip, Peter and John, until they were Baptized with the
 Holy Ghost. I have been the more prolix on this Point, to
 shew that the Apostles and Disciples did so teach, and
 do, as instrumentally to Baptize with the Holy Ghost,
 those that received their Testimony. And at the same
 Time, to clear the Disciples from *J. Jenks's* Charge of
 not Preaching according to the Command of Christ,

when those they preached to, were not immediately Baptized with the Holy Ghost; for tho' the Apostles gave Witness of the Resurrection of the Lord Jesus, with great Power, *Acts* 4. 33. and their Gospel came unto the humble Receivers, not in Word only, but also in Power, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much Assurance, *1 Thes.* 1. 5. But some received them not, and some that did receive their Doctrine, as the *Corinthians*, as well as the *Samaritans*, yet for a Time remained Carnal, until by their farther Labour in the Gospel Ministry by Prayer Night and Day, that they might see them again, and perfect that which was lacking in their Faith, that (according to *1 Thes.* 3. 10) they might so believe, as to know the fulfilling of that Gospel promise of Christ to them, *Joh.* 7. 38. which was, that *out of their Bellies should flow Rivers of living Water*, which was spoken of the Holy Ghost (saith the Evangelist, Verse 39.) which they that believed should receive, and thus should they be Baptized, as well as Taught. But *J. J.* proceeds in Page 15. but to examine his Proof a little farther, *Acts* 8. 17, 18. *Then laid they their Hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost; and when Simon saw that through laying on of the Apostles Hands, the Holy Ghost was given, he offered them Money, &c.* " *W. W.* here makes use of *Simon's* Words, " to prove that the Apostles had Power to Baptize with " the Holy Ghost, but I think they will be of no further " use to him, than only to shew how near *Simon* and he " agree in their Opinion, the one thinking the Apostles " had Power to Baptize with the Holy Ghost, the other " thinking the same.

Ans. For *J. J.* to say, that I make Use of *Simon's* Words, to prove that the Apostles had Power to Baptize with the Holy Ghost, is an abusive Perversion, as every observing Reader may see; for the Words I made Use of are the Evangelist *Luke's*, who wrote the *Acts* of the Apostles; and in the 17. and 18. Verses, relates Matter of Fact, how that when *Simon* saw that through laying on the Apostles Hands, the Holy Ghost was given he offered them Money, &c. And *Luke* doth not relate it as *Simon's* Words,

Words, that he believed the Apostles had Power, by laying on their Hands to Baptize with the Holy Ghost, but it is *Luke's* own Assertion, and therefore my Proof stands good. And as for his saying, they (*i. e. Simon's* Words, as he, tho' falsely calls them) will be of no farther use to me, then to shew how near *Simon* and I agree, I turn them back to him, who more nearly agrees with *Simon* than I, not only in being Baptized in Water, as *Simon* was, but also in writing in a Degree of that Bitterness *Simon* was in, Verse 23. and that only to blacken me, by comparing me with *Simon*, without any Reason so to do, but only his own Assertion. *J. J.* proceeds in Page 16. with Relation of the same Argument thus, " But I think this Argument of his is fairly taken off, without wilful Blindness, or doing Violence to the Text, tho' he says it could not be denied without.

Ans. That Violence, in my Opinion, is done to the Text is manifest, in that what *Luke* delivered by Divine Authority, in *Acts* 8. 17, 18. *J. J.* saith was *Simon's* Words, when in reality they are not, as is before shewen, but whether this Mistake was through willful Blindness, or Ignorance, I shall leave to my Readers consideration. *J.* in Page 17. to prove that, to Baptize with the Holy Ghost, was the peculiar Act of God, quotes *Peter's* Words, in *Acts* 11. 15, 17. And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the Beginning. Verse 18. Forasmuch then as God gave them the like Gift as he did unto us, who believed in the Lord Jesus Christ, what should I that I should withstand God? " From which Text I observe two Things, First, that *Peter* says, the Holy Ghost fell on them as on us, at the Beginning, and how was that, was it by the Preaching of any Man to them? no certainly it was not; it was the free donation of God, and by his own peculiar Act: And *Peter* says, God gave them the like Gift as he did unto us: *Peter* was so far from arrogating any Part of this Power of Baptizing with the Holy Ghost, to himself, as *W. W.* and his Brethren, boastingly and vainly do, to themselves, that he ascribes it wholly unto God, to whom

“ belongeth all Praise, Honour and Glory, for ever and
 “ ever, *Amen*.

Ans. First, I observe that *J. J.* in quoting *Acts* 11: 15, 17. leaves out Verse 16. which had he cited would have plainly shewen the Difference, between *John's* Water Baptism and the Baptism of Christ, (which is that of the Holy Ghost and Fire) by which *Cornelius* and his Friends were Baptized through *Peter's* Ministry: But tho' *J. J.* hath left it out of his Book, it not suiting his Purpose, yet I think proper to cite it. *Then remembred I* (says *Peter*) *the Word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed Baptized with Water, but ye shall be Baptized with the Holy Ghost. Secondly*, I Answer, that *Peter* saying that *the Holy Ghost fell on them as on us in the Beginning*, related to their having it plentifully poured forth on them, to the Astonishment of those of the Circumcision that were with *Peter*, for they heard them speak with Tongues and magnify God; thus the Holy Ghost fell on the *Gentiles* through *Peter's* Ministry, as it did on the Disciples at the Day of *Pentecost*; but tho' he spake with Relation to the Certainty of their having it, viz. *it fell on them as on us at the Beginning*, yet not with relation to the means by which it was conveyed: For tho' he says, God gave them the like Gift as he had done to the Apostles, yet that doth not prove but that it was imparted Instrumentally to them by *Peter's* Preaching, for the spiritual Gift which *Paul* longed to impart to the *Romans*, was properly God's Gift and not *Paul's*; nevertheless he was desirous to be with them, that he might impart it to them, and who dares affirm that *Peter* was not equally qualified with *Paul*. *Thirdly*, to his saying *Peter* was so far from arrogating any Part of this Power of Baptizing with the Holy Ghost to himself, as *W. W.* and his Brethren boasting and vainly do to themselves, that he ascribes it wholly to God, &c. To which I answer, that neither I nor any of my Brethren, that I either heard or read of, arrogated to themselves the Power of Baptizing with the Holy Ghost, but always ascribed it to God alone, according to the Doctrine of the Apostle, 2 *Cor.* 3.

§ 6. *Not that we are sufficient of our selves to think any Thing as of our selves, but our sufficiency is of God; who also hath made us able Ministers of the new Testament, not of the Letter but of the Spirit.* And *J. J.* no doubt, if he read my Book, must know that I never ascribed that Power of Baptizing with the Holy Ghost to the Apostles, and much less arrogate it to my self, or Brethren. But that my Readers may see that I attributed the Power of Baptizing with the Holy Ghost, even when administered by the Apostles unto God and Christ; I cite my Book Page 18. thus, " If *John Hammett* could prove, that God " and Christ never did make use of Men, as Instruments " in Baptizing Spiritually, he would do more, than in " Truth can be done; but the Texts which he hath quot- " ed (if he had quoted them right, which he hath not) " do not in the least prove it: For altho' they manifest " that God and Christ were to do it, and really did Bap- " tize with the Holy Ghost, yet that hinders not, but " that Christ at Times made use of Men, as Instruments " in doing it; and yet in as much as he gave the Power " and Ability, and enabled them so to do, it may be " very proper to say that he did it, as well as when he " did it without any Instrument. But *J. J.* proceeds in " Page 18. 19. thus, *Secondly*, I observe from those " Words, in Verse 17. *for as much then as God gave them " the like Gifts, as he did unto us who believed on the " Lord Jesus Christ, what was I that I should withstand " God, that Peter makes his Defence for something " done by him; after they had received the Holy Ghost, " is clear, for he had made his Defence for his going un- " to the Gentiles, Preaching, &c. before, by his rehearf- " ing of the Vision, therefore that which he has here Re- " lation to, when he says, what was I that I should with- " stand God, must be his commanding them to be Bapti- " zed in the Name of the Lord; for that (together with " his saying, who can forbid Water, &c.) was the Act sub- " sequent to their receiving the Holy Ghost; and if that " had been neglected, it would have been a withstanding " of God; it is so Obvious, that it would be beneath " Reason,*

“ Reason, as well as contrary to Truth, for any to deny
 “ it: For take it otherwise, what weight could there be
 “ in *Peter's* Argument, for him to alledge their
 “ Receiving of the Holy Ghost, to justify himself for
 “ what he had done before they had received it? Why
 “ truly none at all; but it must unavoidably be under-
 “ stood, as is before laid down, that he alledged their Re-
 “ ception of the Holy Ghost, as a sufficient Warrant to
 “ justify himself, for commanding them to be Baptized
 “ in the Name of the Lord; the which had he neglected,
 “ would have been a withstanding of God, in disobeying
 “ the Command, *Mat. 28. 19.* as *W. W.* and his Bre-
 “ thren do.

Ans. That *Peter* makes his Defence for something
 done by him, after they had received the Holy Ghost I
 grant; but that, that someThing was his commanding them
 to be Baptized in the Name of the Lord, I deny: For his
 Defence was in Answer to them of the Circumcision, who
 contended with him, *Acts 11. 2.* and their Charge was
Verse 3. thou wentest into Men uncircumcised, and didst
Eat with them: Therefore their Charge being two fold,
First, that he went into Men uncircumcised, and *Second-*
ly, that he Eat with them; it is no wonder *Peter* in his
 Defence rehearsed the Matter from the Beginning,
 and expounded it by order unto them, and to justify him-
 self for Eating with them, related the Vision which said
 to him *Arise, Slay and Eat:* And tho' he answered, *not so*
Lord, for nothing common or unclean, hath at any Time en-
tered into my Mouth; yet the Voice answered him again,
from Heaven, what God hath cleansed, that call not thou
common. And I am perswaded my Friend *Jenks* hath
 been a Magistrate too long to be Ignorant of the proper
 Way of making a Defence to an Accusation, that there is
 no need of defending one's self for what one is not accus-
 ed of; therefore *Peter* not being accused of Baptizing
 the *Gentiles* with Water, or commanding them to be
 Baptized in Water, in the Name of the Lord, there was
 no need for him to make his Defence concerning it, nei-
 ther did he; for altho' he rehearsed the Matter from the
 Beginning,

Beginning, and expounded it in order unto them; yet there is not one Word in his Defence, that he either Baptized them in Water, or commanded them to be Baptized in Water. From whence it is clear, that he did not alledge their receiving of the Holy Ghost, as a sufficient Warrant to justify himself, for commanding them to be Baptized in the Name of the Lord, as *J. J.* hath unwarrantably asserted, tho' not proved. But why he should bring in *W. W.* and his Brethren for disobeying of God, because they don't Baptize with Water, or command others to be Baptized with Water, I know not, except it be to blacken us in the Eyes of his Brethren; for we freely declare, that Christ hath not commanded us to Baptize with Water; neither do we believe it to be acceptable to God, either for us to be Baptized with Water, or to Baptize others in Water; therefore according to that Saying of the Apostle, (*Whatsoever is not of Faith is Sin*) we should Sin if we did Baptize with Water, or were Baptized in it. For we believe God, through the Power of Christ, hath brought us to the Substance, and shewed us that we are not to practise the Shadow, since the Brightness of the Gospel light, *wherein the Day spring from on High hath visited us.* In Page 19. *J. J.* says, "so that this Text" (viz. *Acts* 10. 44.) which *W. W.* has brought to prove, "that it is in Man's Power to Baptize with the Holy Ghost, I say it is so far from proving it, that it is plainly against him; and doth not only shew, that the Baptizing with the Holy Ghost is the peculiar Act of God, as *J. H.* has declared; but also that Water Baptism is the only Baptism intended in the Commission, *Mat.* 28. 19.

Ans. That I brought *Acts* 10. 44. or any other Text, to prove it is in Man's Power to Baptize with the Holy Ghost, I deny, and desire my Friend *Jenks*, either to quote the Page where I have asserted that it is in Man's Power to Preach the Gospel, or to Baptize according to the Command, *Mat.* 28. 19. or else acknowledge he hath wronged me; for I say as the Apostle said, *2 Cor.* 3. 5, 6. *Not that we are sufficient of our Selves, to think any Thing as of our Selves, but our sufficiency is of God, who*
hath

both made us able Ministers of the new Testament, not of the Letter, but of the Spirit, for the Letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth Life. But *J. J.* asserting that *Acts* 10. 44. is not only against me, but shews that Water Baptism is the only Baptism intended in *Mat.* 28. 19. to me manifests that my Friend *Jenks* hopes to be credited, either without any Shew of Reason, or Argument at all, or else that his bare Assertion is a sufficient Motive for his Reader to believe him; for *Acts* 10. 44. saith only, *that while Peter yet spake these Words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the Word*, which I still conclude was pertinent to my Argument, that the Baptism commanded *Mat.* 28. 19. was the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, and to accompany the Apostles Ministry; for here *Peter* so taught, *that while he yet spake these Words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them that heard the Word, which was the Baptism of the Holy Ghost.* In Page 20, and 21. he proceeds from those Words of *Peter*, *who can forbid Water*, saying, *First*, “ that had the Baptizing them been such an in-
 “ different Thing, as that by any of the Brethrens forbid-
 “ ing it, it must, or might have hindred the proceeding;
 “ then certainly *Peter* would not have dared to command
 “ them to be Baptized in the Name of the Lord. For no
 “ Man of Wisdom dare to command a Thing to be done in
 “ the Name of an Earthly King, where it lies lawfully in
 “ the Power of another to hinder it, much less dare any
 “ Man which has the true Fear of God, command an indif-
 “ ferent Thing to be performed in the Name of the Lord,
 “ who is above all Principalities and Powers, for this un-
 “ deniably would be taking of his Name in vain.

Ans. *James* directed the Believers, if any were Sick among them, to call for the Elders of the Church, and let them Pray over him; anointing him with Oil in the Name of the Lord, *Jam.* 5. 14. And yet anointing the Sick with the Oil, tho’ performed in the Name of the Lord, is an indifferent Thing, there being no Command from Christ so to do; neither doth any Protestant Church that I know of, practise it; I am sure the Baptists, with whom *Joseph Jenks* is joyned, dont; therefore an indifferent Thing

Thing may be performed in the Name of the Lord, and yet in so doing not take his Name in vain ; for I hope none but my Friend *Jenks*, will accuse *James* of teaching the Believers to take the Name of the Lord in vain ; and if an indifferent Thing may be performed in the Name of the Lord, then *Peter* also might command *Cornelius*, &c. to be Baptized in the Name of the Lord, (supposing, tho' not granting, this Baptism was with Water) yet Water Baptism was a *Jewish* Rite, consequently an indifferent Thing, having no Command of Christ to support it ; for there is no Doubt to be made, but that those whom *Paul* Baptized, as *Crispus* and *Gaius*, &c. were Baptized in the Name of the Lord ; and yet it was but an indifferent Thing, for he positively declares he was not sent to do it, therefore to be sure to him an indifferent Thing, yea so indifferent, that he thanks God he had Baptized no more of them than *Crispus* and *Gaius*, &c. In Page 24. *J. J.* citing my Words in my Book Page 20. *But when they heard this, they were Baptized in the Name of the Lord Jesus* ; observe, the Text doth not say they went out where there was Water, *after they heard this and were Baptized in it, but when they heard this they were Baptized*, &c. So here was Hearing and being Baptized, which answered the Command of Teach Baptizing. To which *J. J.* replies, " And I say that this hearing and believing what *Paul* taught them, put them in a Capacity suitable, to be Baptized with Water in the Name of the Lord Jesus, which answered the Command when it was performed.

Answ. But the Reader may observe, that *Acts* 19. 5. doth not say as *J. Jenks* doth, that Hearing and Believing what *Paul* Taught, &c. put them into a Capacity suitable, to be Baptized with Water, which answered the Command when it was performed ; but it saith, as my Book hath it, Page 20. *When they heard this they were Baptized*, which answered the Command, Teach Baptizing, &c. But my Friend *Jenks* goes on in Page 26. on the same Chap. *Acts* 19. thus, " but the Thing he (*i. e.* *Paul*) wanted to know, was, what Name they were Bap-

" tized into, whether it was in the Name of a Christ yet
 " to come, or unto the Name of the Lord Jesus already
 " come; for if they were Baptized into the Name of a
 " Christ yet to come, when as he was already come, and
 " had commanded another Form of Words to be used in
 " the Administration of Baptism, different from the
 " Form used by *John*, that then their Baptism was as no
 " Baptism, and so would avail them nothing.

Ans. Here my Friend *Jenks*, hath done the Business,
 for *John's* Water Baptism, at once; for says he, if they
 were Baptized in the Name of a Christ yet to come,
 when he was already come, and commanded another
 Form of Words, different from the Form used by *John*,
 that then their Baptism was no Baptism, &c. Therefore
 I hope my Friend *Jenks*, nor *John Hammett*, will contend
 any more, that *John's* Baptism was the Beginning of the
 Gospel of Jesus Christ; for if it was, according to him,
 the Gospel was very short, and to last but till Christ suf-
 fered, and then he takes away the Beginning of the Gos-
 pel (according to himself and his Friend *Hammett*) i. e.
John's Baptism, which says *J. Hammett*, Page 7. and 8.
 " he that under any Pretence whatsoever, takes away the
 " Beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, another
 " by the same daring presumptuous Liberty, may take
 " away the Middle, and a third may take away the End,
 " and so by a gradual Progression, extirpate and race it
 " out of the World. " But *J. J.* goes on in Page 26.
 and says, " and that this was the Defect in their Baptism,
 " (i. e. that they were Baptized in the Name of a Christ
 " yet to come, when he was already come, and com-
 " manded another Form of Words, different from that
 " used by *John*) to me appears very clear; for *Apollos*,
 " tho' he was Baptized with the Baptism of *John*, yet it
 " being administred before Christ suffered, and had chang-
 " ed the Form of Words as aforesaid, was not (as we
 " Read of) Baptized again, as these *Ephesians* were.

Ans. How it appears plain, that these *Ephesians* were
 Baptized after Christ gave that Command, *Mat.* 28. 19.
 he has not shewn, the Holy Scriptures are silent con-
 cerning

cerning it ; and Revelation in such a Case, I suppose my Friend *Jenks* don't pretend to ; and it's yet as strange, how he should know that *Apollos* was Baptized before Christ suffered, and had changed the Form of Words ; I desire my Friend *Jenks*, if he would be credited, to shew either from Scripture, or some other good Authority, that these *Ephesians* were Baptized after Christ suffered, or that *Apollos* was Baptized before Christ suffered, or else confess ingenuously that he hath imposed on his Reader, in saying to him, that appears clear, which he can give no Demonstration of, but only his bare say so ; and therefore what he builds on this Assertion, in his Page 27, deserves no other Answer but to be denied, as being without any Foundation or Proof. Near the Bottom of Page 27, *J. J.* says, " yet the sole Power of bestowing it (*i. e.* the Baptism of the Holy Ghost) the Lord hath vested in himself, and hath not committed it to Man, as he hath that of Preaching the Gospel, and of Baptizing.

Ans. Baptizing and Preaching are joined together in the Command, and what God hath joined together, let no Man put asunder ; and they had the same Power to Baptize as they had to Preach, *viz.* the Power of the Holy Spirit, and the Baptism they were to administer by their Preaching, was to be Christ's own Baptism, as well as the Teaching was to be whatever he had commanded them ; and his Baptism is the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, according to the Prophecy of *John, Mat. 3. 11.* Therefore for *Joseph Jenks* to say they had not Power as well to Baptize with the Holy Spirit by their Teaching, as they had to Teach, is in my Judgment an Undervaluing, not only the Apostles, but Christ also ; for he saith, (*John 20. 21.*) *As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you ;* and beyond all Question he was sent of the Father, to Baptize with the Holy Ghost, as well as preach glad Tidings to the Meek : Therefore as the Father sent him to Baptize with the Holy Ghost, so sent he his Disciples ; and in order that they might have a Measure of the same Power which he had in the Fulness, he breathed on them, and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost, which at the Day of

Pentecost came on them in a plentiful manner, whereby they were made able Ministers of the new Testament, and did in the Course of their Ministry not only work Miracles, but instrumentally ministred the Spirit also as is clear from *Gal.* 3. 5. But how the sole Power of Preaching the Gospel came to be invested in Man, (as my Friend *Jenks's* Words imply) he hath not yet told us, nor I believe ever can; for tho' they were made able Ministers of the new Testament, and of the Spirit also, yet they had no Sufficiency of themselves, but what they had was of God; and tho' they had it in their Earthen Vessels as a Treasure, yet the Excellency of the Power was of God, and not of them; for as Christ had all Power both in Heaven and in Earth committed unto him, so there it remains still, and will do for ever, and ever; and yet at his Pleasure, he communicates thereof sufficient, to enable his Ministers to Teach, and thereby to Baptize those that receive the Gospel. *J. J.* in Page 20. says, in relation to what I said, in Page 22. viz. "Moreover, "*Paul* tells *Timothy* to stir up the Gift of God which is in thee, by the Putting on of my Hands; to which says "*J. J.* I hope the Reader will have the Wisdom, as to observe, that *Paul* himself, calls the Gift which he, exhorts *Timothy* to stir up, the Gift of God: So then it was not the Gift of *Paul*, nor yet of his disposing or dispensing, as it must have been to carry such a Force as to overthrow *J. H's* Argument; and I think we have as good grounds to believe *Paul*, as we have to believe *W. W.*

Ans. Paul's calling the Gift, which he exhorted *Timothy* to stir up, the Gift of God, makes nothing against my Argument, that *Paul* dispensed it; for I have as good ground to believe *Paul* as to believe *J. J.* who saith expressly, *2 Tim.* 1. 6. *Wherefore I put thee in Remembrance, that thou stir up the Gift of God, which is in thee, by the Putting on of my Hands.* And again in his first Book, Chap. 4. Verse 14. exhorts him thus, *Neglect not the Gift that is in thee, which was given by Prophecy, with the Laying on of the Hands of the Presbytery.* From whence I farther observe, the Gift that was in *Timothy*, was dispensed

enced by Preaching, as well as by Laying on the Hands of Paul, and the other Elders; for he that Prophecieth speaketh unto Men to Edification and Exhortation and Comfort, according to Paul's Words, 1 Cor. 14. 3. From all which, it is Evident, that the Disciples had the Dispensing of more than one single Gift of the Spirit, and therefore my Argument stands good against *J. Hammett*. and *J. J.* too. Again in Page 30. and 31. *J. J.* proceeds, "if he (*i. e.* *W. W.*) proves, that as Ambassadors, or in any other Capacity they had the Disposition of the real Property of the Spirit, so as that they could dispense this one single Gift of it, as the Argument by *John Hammett* is stated, then he gains this Argument, but till then, *J. H.*'s stands good against him.

Ans. There is not the Word, real Property of the Spirit, in *J. Hammett*'s stating the Question, in his Book Page 10. tho' my Friend *Jenks* hath craftily put it into his, in Page 31. in order, perhaps, to mislead his Reader, but having given mine this Hint, that he may look and see how the Argument was stated by *J. Hammett*, I shall proceed, if I prove, that the Disciples had Power from Christ to dispense this Gift of Wisdom, or any other Gift of the Spirit; I prove they had Power given them to Baptize with the Spirit, according to *J. Hammett*'s stating the Argument, which I both fully did in my Answer to *John Hammett*, and shall now also; for he that is sent by Christ in order that another may be filled with the Holy Ghost, hath Power, from Christ to dispense the Gift of the Spirit; but *Ananias* was sent by Christ, that *Saul* might be filled with the Holy Ghost, *Acts* 8. 17. Therefore he had Power from Christ to dispense the Holy Ghost: And again, they who have Power from Christ, to Administer a Gift of the Spirit to another, have Power from Christ to dispense the Gift of the Spirit; but the Presbytery, or Elders of the Church, had Power from Christ to administer the Gift of the Spirit, see 1 Tim. 1. 14. therefore &c. From which it appears, both from *J. Hammett*'s stating the Argument, and also from *J. J.*'s confession thereto, that the Disciples had Power from Christ, to Baptize with the Holy Ghost: But further to shew

shew, that *J. J.* believes the Apostles were Instrumental of Believers receiving the Gifts of the Spirit, take his own Words, in Page 31. " And I still grant, as I have done before, that the Apostles by their orderly proceeding in Prayer, and Laying on of Hands, were Instruments of Believers receiving such spiritual Gifts, as God was graciously pleased to bestow on them, as *Peter* and *John* were by Prayer, and laying on of Hands upon the *Samaritans* ; " from which Acknowledgment of his, it is plain, he doth not deny, but that the Apostles were Instrumental in Baptizing with the Holy Ghost ; for the *Samaritans* receiving the Holy Ghost, was a being Baptized with it, which he had granted the Apostles were instrumental in ; so that at last he hath granted my Argument, notwithstanding all his Cavils against it, which I am glad of, for the Sake of my Readers, that they may see that what he hath so long opposed, (*viz.* the Disciples Baptizing with the Holy Ghost) he hath now in Effect consented to ; but if upon Reading this, *J. J.* should say, he only granted that the Apostles were Instrumental of Believers receiving spiritual Gifts, and that God was the Giver of them ; to which I answer, so say I too, that they were but Instruments, both in preaching the Gospel, and Baptizing with the Holy Spirit. But if *J. J.* should further object, that tho' the Apostles were Instrumental in Believers receiving the Holy Ghost, by their Prayer and Laying on of Hands ; yet it don't from thence follow, that they were Instrumental of Believers receiving the Holy Ghost by their Preaching, and that is what he opposes in me. To which I Reply, that I have in the former Part of this Book, shewn from *Acts* 4. 24. to 31. that the Apostles Prayers were attended with excellent Teaching ; so that if they were Instrumental in Believers receiving the Holy Ghost, (as my Friend *J. J.* grants they were) then the Apostles answered the Command, *Teach all Nations, Baptizing them into the Name of the Father, &c.* But to proceed, *J. J.* in Page 34. says, " Now if that which *W. W.* has with great Confidence affirmed, were true, (*viz.* that the Baptism

" which

“ which Christ Commanded, *Mat.* 28. 19. were con-
 “ tained in the Teaching, and not separate, and that it
 “ was the Baptism of the Holy Ghost: Then *Peter*, not-
 “ withstanding the plain Directions the Lord had given
 “ him for his Proceeding, and his being so wonderfully
 “ filled with the Holy Ghost, which was to lead him in-
 “ to all Truth, was disobedient to that Command of
 “ Christ, and did not Teach the *Jews* (*i. e.* in the 2d of
 “ *Acts*) according thereunto; for it is evident that they
 “ were not Baptized with the Holy Ghost by *Peter's*
 “ Teaching, neither did they receive the Holy Ghost, un-
 “ till some Days after.

Ans. And how doth *J. J.* know that the three Thou-
 sand Persons which were added to the Apostles, mention-
 ed in *Acts* 2. 41. were not Baptized with the Holy Ghost,
 by *Peter's* Teaching; I am sure he hath not learnt this out
 of the Holy Scriptures. And yet he finds great Fault
 with me in his Page 37. for saying it was the Practice of
 the *Jews* in initiating their Profelytes to Baptize them in
 Water, saying, had I intended that any should believe
 me, I should have quoted the Scripture, which so declar-
 ed it, if there be any such; but if there be none, then I
 am the Man who impose on my Reader, &c. But that
 perhaps may be an Imposition on the Readers, from *W. W.*
 which will not be so from *J. J.* at least in his own Judg-
 ment. But to return to those three Thousand, which
 were added to the Apostles, according to *Acts* 2. 41. if
 they were added to the Church, then they were Baptiz-
 ed with the Holy Ghost, as is plain, from *1 Cor.* 12. 12,
 13. where the Apostle saith, of all the Members of the
 Body or Church of Christ, that by one Spirit they were
 Baptized into one Body; *whether they were Jews or Gen-
 tiles, whether Bond or Free*; from whence it is evident,
 that all who were truly initiated into the Church, came
 in by the Baptism of the Holy Spirit; and that those
 three Thousand, mentioned *Acts* 2. 41. were added to
 the Church, that very Day when *Peter* Preached to them
 is also evident from the Text; for that saith, they were
 added to the Apostles, who at that Time were the
 Church

Church of Christ, therefore they were Baptized with the Holy Ghost, by which Members are only brought into that Holy Body of which Christ is Head; so that it don't follow, from what I have said, as *J. J.* insinuates, that *Peter* was disobedient to the Command of Christ, in not Teaching the *Jews* according thereunto, as he hath asserted, but not proved; for tho' when they were pricked in their Heart, and said unto the Apostles, what shall we do; *Peter* answered, *Repent and be Baptized, every one of you, in the Name of Jesus Christ, for the Remission of Sins, and ye shall receive the Gift of the Holy Ghost.* Yet that does not in the least prove, but that the Holy Ghost, which he there told them they should receive upon their Repentance, &c. was given them that same Day, upon their Repentance, and closeing with those many Words by which *Peter* exhorted them. In Page 35. *J. J.* says, " And to deny Water Baptism, to be the Baptism which Christ Commanded, (as *W. W.* hath done) is not only an implicit Charge upon *Peter*, of Preaching up a Baptism distinct from that which Christ commanded him; but also a great Reflection upon the Holy Ghost; that instead of leading *Peter* into all Truth, (as Christ had promised) lead him to disobey Christ's Command.

Answ. I have not charged *Peter* of Preaching up a Baptism distinct from that which Christ Commanded; yet if at any Time he Preached up Water Baptism, that was no more than *Paul* practised, and that without any Command from Christ, as is clear from his own Words, *1 Cor. 1. 17.* But if Water Baptism be a distinct Baptism from the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, as *J. J.* seems to allow, in the above cited passages, then it follows, that Water Baptism is not one Part, and the Holy Ghost Baptism the other, of the one Baptism spoken off, in *Eph. 4. 15.* but there was then in the Church one Baptism, as there was one Lord, and one Faith, and that Baptism the Baptism of the Spirit, for by that they were all Baptized into one Body, *1 Cor. 12. 13.* Therefore Water Baptism is no Part of that one Baptism which *Paul* recommended to the Church

Church at *Ephesus*. But as for his asserting, me to deny *Water Baptism* to be the *Baptism* which *Christ* Commanded, is a great Reflection on the *Holy Ghost*, that instead of it's leading *Peter* into all Truth, led him to disobey *Christ's* Commands: As I deny the Consequence, so also I abhor the Suggestion: For what if *Peter*, at Times, permitted or preached up *Water Baptism*, and that without any Command so to do; will that be any Reflection on the *Holy Ghost*, any more than his compelling the *Gentiles* to live, as did the *Jews*? as is clear he did, *Gal.* 2. 14. And tho' the *Holy Spirit* leads all that follow it into all Truth; yet if at any Time, Men leave its Guidance, and follow their own Spirits, and thereby run into that which is not agreeable to the Gospel Dispensation, it is no Reflection upon the Spirit of Truth, seeing that never leads into any Thing but Truth, but is a Reprover of all Error and untruth; but I don't say that, because some of the Disciples at certain Times, did comply with the then Weakness and Infancy of some in the Church, even to condescend to Baptize them with Water, that therein they sinned; neither do I believe *Paul's* Circumcising *Timothy*, or going into the Temple to Purify himself with those who had a Vow on them, was a Sin; yet neither of these, nor *Water Baptism*, are from those Examples of the Apostles, to be admitted amongst *Christians* at this Day, seeing it does not appear they had any Command from *Christ* for the Performance thereof; tho' for the Weakness of some in the Church, they were complied with. In Page 36. *J. J.* says, " but it is clear, that *Water Baptism* was that which the Lord Commanded, and that *Peter* durst not to have exhorted them to be Baptized in the Name of *Jesus Christ*, if he had not had a Command so to do; for that would have been a Sin, as hath been minded.

Answ. To say, it's clear *Water Baptism* was that which the Lord Commanded, because *Peter* Commanded it to be Practised in the Name of the Lord, or Lord *Jesus*, is no true Way of Arguing, any more than to say, because *James* exhorted if any were Sick among Believers, they should call for the Elders of the Church, and they should

Pray over him, Anointing him with Oil, in the Name of the Lord: That therefore Anointing the Sick with Oil, in the Name of the Lord, was a Command of Christ, to continue in the Church, is an inconclusive absurd Way of Arguing: But to say it would have been a Sin in *Peter*, in Commanding them to be Baptized with Water, in the Name of the Lord, if he had not had a Command from the Lord so to do, is more than the Asserter can prove; for those *Paul* Baptized with Water, were Baptized in the Name of the Lord, according to *J. J.*'s Confession, in his Page 51. and that *Paul* had no Command from Christ to administer Water Baptism, is clear from his own Words, in 1 Cor. i. 17. Therefore without my Friend *Jenks* will accuse *Paul* with Sinning, in Baptizing in the Name of the Lord, without a Command from the Lord, (for he had none) he must also excuse *Peter* from Sinning, or else the same Thing is a Sin in *Peter*, which is none in *Paul*, according to my Opponents Way of Arguing.

In Page 36. *J. J.* says, " for their (*i. e. Cornelius* and his Friends) receiving the Holy Ghost, could not be a Reason sufficient to excuse him (*i. e. Peter*) to his Brethren, for his going in and Eating with, and Preaching to Men uncircumcised, before he knew that they should receive the Holy Ghost, no, his relating the Vision was his Excuse for that, as hath been already minded.

Ans. That *Peter* did Eat with *Cornelius* and his Friends, before they had received the Holy Ghost, doth not appear from the Text, but the contrary; therefore what my Friend *Jenks* raises as an Argument, to shew Water Baptism was commanded, in *Mat.* 28. 19. from this Foundation, falls to the Ground, without any further Answer, than denying it to be True, as every one that can Read may see *Acts* the 10th. And I think it is Pity, a Man that bears that Character in the World, as *J. J.* doth, should thus impose on his Reader that for Scripture which is neither Scripture nor Truth. In Page 38. *J. J.* says, " now I say, that *Philip* must teach the *Eunuch*, ei-
" ther

" ther by Virtue of Christ's Command, or else he taught
 " him without any; and if he Taught by Virtue of
 " Christ's Command, *Mat. 28. 19.* then *W. W.*'s Argu-
 " ment (that the Baptism Commanded *Mat. 28. 19.* was
 " one Act with the Teaching, and not separated) must
 " needs fall to the Ground; for that *Philip* Taught the
 " *Eunuch*, and yet he was not Baptized with the Holy
 " Ghost, by his Teaching, is clear; for if he had, *Philip*
 " would have known that he believed in the Lord Jesus,
 " without putting that to him, (to wit) *if thou believest*
 " *with all thine Heart, thou mayest.*

Answ. How doth *J. J.* know that the *Eunuch* was not
 Baptized with the Holy Ghost by *Philip*'s Preaching; if
 he was made a Member of the Church, he was Baptized
 by the one Spirit into the Church, as hath been before
 observed, in the Case of those three Thousand mentioned,
Acts 2. 41. But if my Friend *Jenks* will say he was not
 made a Member of the Church by *Philip*'s Preaching;
 then I query what good his Water Baptism did him.
 But *J. J.* in Page 45. justifies *J. Hammett*, in saying
 that the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, is a spiritual Act of
 God himself, wholly invisible and unknown to us in his
 performing it; and yet here he asserts that the *Eunuch* was
 not Baptized by *Philip*'s Preaching, tho' the Scripture is
 silent therein; but it is like *J. J.* and *J. Hammett*, pro-
 fess greater Skill, in understanding when Men are not
 Baptized with the Holy Ghost, than when they are, that
 being most agreeable to their Experience. In Page 39.
J. J. says, " now I cannot but take Notice, that when-
 " soever *W. W.* is hard put to it for an Argument, to e-
 " vade Water Baptism, being the Baptism intended in
 " the Command, *Mat. 28. 19.* (though he hath many
 " subtle Evasions) he forthwith flees to *Peter*'s compelling
 " the *Gentiles*, to live as did the *Jews*, and to *Paul*'s
 " Circumcising of *Timothy*, &c.

Answ. And why may not *W. W.* flee to Scripture Ar-
 guments, especially such as that of *Peter*'s compelling the
Gentiles to live as did the *Jews*, and *Paul*'s Circumcising
Timothy, seeing these Scriptures, and many more such

like, (which perhaps my Friend *J. J.* intended by his &c.) plainly shew that the Apollles both did, and compelled others to do also, such Things as they had no Command for from Christ; therefore their Practice in that, which did not belong to the Dispensation of the Gospel, as Water Baptism, (which belonged to *John*) and Circumcision (which belonged to *Moses*, or *Abraham*) no way proves the Use of either of Them, necessary to us who are not under the Law, but under the Gospel of Christ. But *J. J.* proceeds in Page 39. " let the Reader observe, that it doth not appear that any of these *Jewish* Ceremonies, were performed in the Name of the Lord Jesus, as signifying that they were Gospel Ordinances, as that of Water Baptism was, and 'till *W. W.* can prove that those *Jewish* Ceremonies were performed in the Name of the Lord Jesus, his Arguments from thence will appear to have no weight in them,

Ans. Water Baptism being performed in the Name of the Lord, or Lord Jesus, no way signifies it was a Gospel Ordinance, as *J. J.* suggests, for he himself allows in Page 50, 51. that the *Corinthians* were Baptized in the Name of the Lord. And yet that those *Corinthians* which were Baptized by *Paul*, were not Baptized by Virtue of any Command from Christ, is Evident from his own Words, 1 *Cor.* 1. 17. Therefore their, or any others being baptized with Water in the Name of the Lord, no way proves Water Baptism to be a Gospel Ordinance; neither was it ever called so in the Holy Scripture. And therefore for *J. J.* to say, that 'till *W. W.* can prove that any of those *Jewish* Ceremonies were performed in the Name of the Lord Jesus, as signifying that they were Gospel Ordinances, as That of Water Baptism was; his Arguments from thence will appear to have no Weight in them, is meerly to beg the Question; for 'till *J. J.* shews, that being Baptized with Water in the Name of the Lord Jesus, proves Water Baptism to be a Gospel Ordinance, his Argument against me has no Weight in it. In Page 41. 42. *J. J.* having cited my Words, that Water Baptism cannot wash away Sin, but that of Fire and the Holy Ghost

Ghost can, &c. to which he replies thus, " I must say he
 " hath abused the Scripture in two Respects: *First*, in
 " denying Water Baptism to have that Efficacy, which
 " in its inferior Degree, the Scriptures allows it to have,
 " as hath been shewed. *Secondly*, in attributing that to
 " the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, which in its most su-
 " pereminent Degree, is only proper to the Blood of
 " Christ, as hath been shewed.

Ans. First, the Holy Scriptures no where say, that
 Water Baptism washed away Sin in any Degree, tho' ever
 so inferior; neither can any Body who have not given
 away their Reason, (as the *Papists* have to their Priests,
 to believe Transubstantiation) believe that Water (which
 reaches but the Outside) can wash away Sin, which Lodg-
 es in the Heart and Conscience; and what tho' the *Jews*
 were bid to Repent, and be Baptized for the Remission of
 their Sins; this don't prove that Water Baptism would
 wash away their Sins, for if they had Repented and turn-
 ed to God, (which Repentance naturally implies) tho' they
 had not been Baptized with Water, they would have had
 their Sins blotted out, (which is as much as to say they
 were remitted) as is clear from *Peter's* own Words, *Acts*
 3. 19. Where he bids the *Jews* Repent and be Converted,
 that their Sins might be Blotted out, when the Times of
 Refreshing shall come from the Presence of the Lord.
Secondly, that the Baptism of the Holy Spirit washes a-
 way Sin, is not only the Experience of every true *Chri-*
stian, but also implied in divers Texts of Scripture, some
 of which follow, 1 *Cor.* 6. 11. Here *Paul* tells the *Corin-*
thians, Some of whom had been gross Sinners, (as the
 same Text shews) *But now are you Washed, but now are*
ye Sanctified in the Name of our Lord Jesus, and by the
Spirit of our God; so that the Spirit by which they were
 all Baptized into one Body, washed away their Sins. *Tit.*
 3. 4, 5. *But after that the Kindness and Love of God our*
Saviour, towards Men appeared, not by Works of Righte-
ousness which we had done, but according to his Mercy he
saved us, by the Washing of Regeneration, and the Renew-
ing of the Holy Ghost, which he Shed on us Abundantly,
 through

through Jesus Christ. 1 Pet. 1. 22. *Seing ye have purefied your Souls, in obeying the Truth through the Spirit.* From all which it evidently appears, the Baptism of the Holy Spirit in its Operation regenerates, and thereby Baptizes or Washes away Sin, and saves from it; so that my Readers may see I have brought some substantial Scripture proof for my Assertion, without going to the *Quakers* Writings, as he Scoffingly suggests. Again *J. J.* says, in Page 42. "That God gives to his Children the Spirit of Power and of Love, and of a sound Mind, and many other Graces of the Spirit, as Joy, Peace, Long-Suffering, Gentleness, Goodness, Faith, Meekness, Temperance, &c. And yet that Men may have these Gifts and Graces of the Spirit, and yet not be Baptized with the Holy Ghost is clear, that being a Gift different from the other.

Answ. Every Member of the true Church of God, or Body of Christ, is Baptized with one Spirit, according to 1 Cor. 12. 13. But I deny that God gives to his Children the Spirit of Power and of Love, and of a sound Mind, and the many other Graces of the Spirit mentioned by him, 'till they are Baptized by the one Spirit, into the one Body or Church of Christ; for none can be his Children, in a Gospel Sense, 'till they submit to this his only Baptism. *J. J.* proceeds in Page 43. "We Read of none being Baptized with the Holy Ghost, but that they spake with Tongues, &c. The which Baptism was apparently manifest to the Beholders; and when *W. W.* and the Rest of the *Quakers*, which so highly Boast of being Baptized with the Holy Ghost, can shew Signs thereof equal with that, then there will be good Cause to believe that they are so Baptized, but till then, there will be as good Cause to say, they are not Baptized at all, but are Disobedient to Christ's Command, and are found to be Fighters against his Ordinances.

Answ. All true Members of the Primitive Church, whether *Jews* or *Gentiles*, whether Bond or Free, were all Baptized by one Spirit, (and I hope my Friend *Jenks* will not deny it to be the Holy Spirit, for it was the very same

same by which God gave Faith, and the working of Miracles, &c.) into that one Body of which Christ was Head; but that they did not all speak with Tongues, is clear from the Apostles Words, 1 Cor. 12. 29. 30. *Are all Apostles? are all Prophets? are all Teachers? are all Workers of Miracles? Have all the Gifts of Healing? Do all speak with Tongues? Do all Interpret?* From whence it plainly appears, that tho' all were not Apostles, nor Prophets, neither did all speak with Tongues, yet all were Baptized with the one Holy Spirit, into the Church of Christ; therefore the *Quakers* have good Cause to plead for this one Baptism, as the true Baptism of Christ, through that Experience that God had given them of the Vertue thereof, and yet be far from Boasting, as *J. J.* insinuates, tho' they don't speak with Tongues; and if they shew forth the Spirit of Christianity in their Lives and Conversations, there will be good Cause to believe they have been Baptized by one Spirit, into that Holy Body of which Christ is Head. In Page 43. *J. J.* proceeds, "And further to what *W. W.* says, that the Baptism of the Holy Ghost cleanseth or washeth away Sin, I desire him "if he can, to prove that ever any were Baptized with "the Holy Ghost, before their Sins were remitted or "washed away.

Answ. If I should endeavour to prove that any were Baptized with the Holy Ghost, before their Sins were washed away, I should therein Argue against my own Judgment, for I Believe, and also Know, that by the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, Sin is Washed away; so that as Men come to the one, they Witness the other, for as by the Baptism of Christ, Men are thoroughly purged and washed from Sin, and all Uncleannefs, so by the renewing of the Holy Ghost, they are preserved clean for God through the Spirit to Tabernacle in, and that my Friend *Hammett* is of the same Mind with me herein (tho' *J. J.* differs, both from him and the Truth too) is clear, from his 2c. 21. Pages, where he *i. e.* *J. H.* says, "Secondly, "if he should tell us, that the Baptism of the Holy "Ghost, does not put away the filthy Inclinations of our fleshly

" fleshly Minds, the Apostles Words would naturally
 " tend to abate our Coveting it, and also be Contradicti-
 " ous to all the other Descriptions of its Divine and puri-
 " fying Operations: " From whence it is plain, that
 J. H. as well as W. W. holds that the Baptism of the
 Holy Ghost, *puts or washes away our filthy Inclinations;*
and that if we should deny it, we should therein contradict
all the Descriptions we have of its divine and purifying
Operations. In Page 44. J. J. comes to nibble at what
 I say, in my Book, in Page 36, 37 38. in Answer to J. H.
 concerning 1 Pet. 3. 20. but he doth not take on him to
 Answer what I wrote, but says, " I shall only observe,
 " that he, (*i. e.* W. W.) says it is Absurd to say, that
 " any Figure is the Figure or Type of another Figure, I
 " say so to.

Ans. Herein, tho' my Friend *Jenks* agrees with me,
 thinking thereby to get his Argument, yet its plain, in
 joyning with me, he contradicts his Brother *Hammett*, for
 says J. Hammett, in Page 19. " Observe the Apostle,
 " in Verse 20. informs us of sundry Particulars, as *First*,
 " that in the Days of *Noah*, wherein the almost uni-
 " versal Deluge happened, that eight Persons were saved.
 " *Secondly*, In what they were saved; and that was
 " in the *Ark*. *Thirdly*, by what they were saved,
 " and that was by Water: And in the 21st Verse,
 " he informs us, *First*, that the Temporal Salvation
 " was Figurative (or a Figure) of Baptism, and that
 " Baptism is a Figure also, and such a Figure as is com-
 " parable to it. " From whence say I, its plain that
 J. H. and J. Jenks, differ as much from each other,
 in this, as they do from the Truth and me therein; but
 what I said in Answer to J. Hammett, with Respect to
 1 Pet. 3. 20. Stands unanswered by J. J. Therefore to
 avoid Tautologies, I refer my Reader to my former Book
 Page 36, 37, 38. In Page 45. J. J. saith, " All that
 " we Read of in Scripture, that are said to be Baptized
 " with the Holy Ghost, the Effects thereof was plain and
 " manifest, for they spake with Tongues, and the Be-
 " holders could Witness to it; but the like thereof, nor

" no Thing like thereto, I never yet heard of, to be seen
" in any *Quaker*.

Answ. Either *J. Jenks* must deny the Spirit of God to be the Holy Ghost, (by which the Church were all Baptized, whether *Jews* or *Gentiles*, Bond or Free;) or else he hath not read the Holy Scriptures; for I cannot think he will venture to say, they all speak with Tongues, in opposition to the plain Import of *Paul's* Words, 1 *Cor.* 12. 30. But as for his Scoff at the *Quakers*, because they don't speak with Tongues, I take patiently, for *Christ's* Sake: But perhaps his Brethren will not be much obliged to him for it; for if none are Baptized with the Holy Spirit, but those who speak with Tongues, not only the *Quakers* may be excluded, but also the *Baptists*, and all *Protestants*: Whereby we may see how good a Friend he is to the Christian Religion in general, as well as to the *Quakers* in particular, in excluding all those from the Baptism of the Holy Spirit, who don't speak with Tongues, which is in Consequence excluding them from the Church, of which *Christ* is Head; for all that are Members thereof, are made so by the Baptism of the Spirit, as is clear from 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. before spoken to. In Page 46. *J. J.* says, " observe *Paul*, (in 1 *Cor.* 1. 17.) " makes Baptizing and Preaching, two distinct Things; " contrary to *W. W's* Affirmation.

Answ. I never either said, or affirmed, that Water Baptism and Preaching were not two distinct Things, for it is Water Baptism the Apostle speaks of, in 1 *Cor.* 1. 17. as shall be shewn in its Place; and therefore he wrongs me, in suggesting that I affirm that Baptism there spoken of, and Preaching, are not two distinct Things. But he proceeds, Page 46. saying, " It is clear, that by " this Command, the Disciples were to Baptize, as well " as to Teach, and had the like Power given them to perform the one, as they had to perform the other; and " this *W. W.* has granted; but says he, the Baptizing " here Commanded, is that of the Holy Ghost, and is " one Act with Teaching, and not separated; but that

" Assertion of his hath been sufficiently refuted, and the
 " contrary fully proved.

An/w. That the contrary of my Assertion hath been fully proved I deny, for he hath not in the least proved any such Thing, unless his bare Say-so, will pass with him for Proof, but with me it will not; for I must have an Argument grounded on Scripture, before I assent to it, which as yet I have not: But farther to confirm my former Assertion, *viz. That Baptism Commanded, Mat. 28. 19. is the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, and one Act with Teaching.* Let it be considered, that the Baptism Commanded *Mat. 28. 19.* was the Baptism of Christ, (and not of *John*) and also, that the Gospel, Preached by the Apostles, was the Gospel of Christ; which Gospel, was no less than the Power of God unto Salvation, to every one who Believed. *Rom. 1. 16.* In this Gospel, therefore, is the Power of performing the Baptism of Christ; for it is a Truth beyond Contradiction, that the Power of God unto Salvation, is sufficient to Baptize every one who Believeth therein, into the Body of Christ; whence it appears, the Gospel Ministry is a Powerful and Baptizing Ministry; and therefore *Teach Baptizing*, as before, may not be understood to be two distinct Things, but one individual Act, *viz. a Baptizing through the Spirit* such as believingly hear the Gospel. For tho' the Ministers thereof, are not sufficient of themselves to perform this great Work, yet their Sufficiency is of God, who maketh them able Ministers, not of the Letter, but of the Spirit. *2 Cor. 3.* And if able Ministers of the Spirit, through the Power of Christ strengthening them, then Ministers of that Baptism which Christ Commanded, *Mat. 28. 19.* And seeing they could not do this by any Power of their own, therefore our Lord graciously promised to be with them always, even to the End of the World, to help them to answer that Commandment. And such was the Efficacy of this Baptizing Ministry, that thereby Men were Baptized into the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, *Turned from Darknes to Light, and from the Power of Satan unto God.* In Page 49. *J. J.* replies to my Book Page 45. and says

says, " Here says *W. W.* but in *Paul's* saying, he was not
 " sent to Baptize, there is no Necessity to go from the
 " literal and most natural Signification of the Text; well
 " then by his own Argument, *Paul* was not by the Com-
 " mission which Christ had given forth, to Baptize at all,
 " with any Sort of Baptism. For *Paul's* Words, when
 " he saith he was not sent to Baptize, are indefinite, he
 " mentions no Sort of Baptism; so that without going
 " from the literal Signification of the Text, no Sort of
 " Baptism can be allowed to be contained in his Com-
 " mission.

Ans/w. In Page 51. *J. J.* says, " that Water Baptism
 " hath been plainly proved to be the Baptism intended in
 " Christ's Commission, *Mat.* 28. 19. and also that *Paul*
 " Baptized those *Corinthians*, by Vertue of that Com-
 " mission ". From whence its clear, *J. J.* allows that
Crispus and *Gaius*, &c. were Baptized with Water, as in-
 deed they were; and therefore *Paul's* saying, Christ sent
 me not to Baptize, most naturally related to Water Bap-
 tism, which he had just then been thanking God that he
 Practised no oftner amongst the *Corinthians*, than in Bap-
 tizing *Crispus* and *Gaius*, &c. with. But it doth not follow
 from thence, that he was not sent to Baptize with the
 Baptism of Christ, for the Baptism he there thanked God
 he had Baptized no more of them with, was Water Bap-
 tism, and to that Baptism only, he had Relation;
 when he saith, *for Christ sent me not to Baptize*; for
 it must be allowed, if it had Relation thereto, the
 Baptism of Christ, he could not have thanked God that
 he had Baptized no more of them. But *J. J.* proceeds
 in Page 51. and saith, " and for *Paul's* saying he was not
 " sent to Baptize, but to Preach the Gospel, I doubt not
 " but it will plainly appear, to all unprejudiced Persons,
 " (who do not bend their whole Force to impugn Christ's
 " Ordinances) that the true Sense and Meaning thereof,
 " has been rightly opened; and that Water Baptism hath
 " been plainly proved, to be the Baptism intended in
 " Christ's Commission, *Mat.* 28. 19. and also that *Paul*
 " Baptized those *Corinthians* by Vertue of that Commission.

Ans. First, I must take the Liberty to dissent from my Friend *Jenks*, in what he saith, he don't doubt will appear to all unprejudiced Persons; that the true Sense and Meaning of *Paul's* saying, Christ sent me not to Baptize &c. hath been rightly opened. I on the contrary conclude, that none but those who are Prejudiced and Blind-ed, and that to a great Degree, can think *J. J.* hath given the true Sense and Meaning of *Paul's* Words, where he said, for Christ sent me not to Baptize, &c. For observe, *J. J.* saith, *Paul* Baptized those *Corinthians*, by Vertue of Christ's Commission: But *Paul* saith, Christ sent me not to Baptize; now here being a plain Contradiction betwixt *Paul* and *Joseph Jenks*, which of them must we believe? why, *J. J.* or else in his Account we must be prejudiced Persons, and bend all our Force to impugn Christ's Ordinances; but let him or any other Men that set themselves to Contradict the Apostle, judge us as they please; yet we conclude the Apostle knew his own Commission better than they who oppose him; for he himself said, Christ sent me not to Baptize, therefore those *Corinthians* were not Baptized by Vertue of Christ's Commission, *Mat. 28. 19.* Secondly, as to his saying, he doubts not but it will appear, that Water Baptism hath been plainly proved to be the Baptism intended, *Mat. 28. 19.* it deserves no other Answer in this Place, than to be Denied, I having, I doubt not, already plainly proved the contrary. Therefore I cannot but observe to my Reader, the great difficulty Men run into, when they set themselves against the Truth, and those that contend for it, as *J. J.* and his Brother *J. Hammett* have done; one saying *Paul* Baptized the *Corinthians* by Vertue of Christ's Commission; the other, that he had Water Baptism within the Verge of his Commission, &c. Whereby they don't only lay themselves open to be refuted, as I conceive they have been in the foregoing Pages, but also they are forced to deny the Apostle's Words, viz. that Christ sent him not to Baptize, and thereby manifest themselves as much against him as us; now would those who joyn with them turn to the Spirit of Truth in themselves, and thereby

be led into all Truth, they would see that Water Baptism was *John's*, and that its End was, that Christ might be made manifest to *Israel*; who by his Divine Power, both washes and sanctifies the Hearts of all such who obey him, in the Way of his Manifestation. Thus they would see the End of *John's* Baptism, which being fulfilled, terminates in Christ, who is the Substance, whose Baptism being spiritual, according to the Nature of the Gospel-Dispensation, is to continue the one Baptism, by which all the Members of the Church are Baptized into one Body, and made to Drink into one Spirit, and thereby nourished up to everlasting Life; that this might be their Portion, and not only theirs but all Men's, is what my Soul truly Desires: And I very well know if they would hear Christ (the great Shepherd of all the Sheep) as he utters his Voice in the Heart, and follow him in the Way which he Leads, they would be led from those carnal Ordinances, which Perish with the using, unto that Spiritual and Soul quickening Substance, whereby they would, by living Experience, know a passing from Death to Life; for I often have, and at this Time do feel, the Love of God, in Christ Jesus our Lord, to flow unto many amongst the *Baptists*, whose Hearts in some Measure, are desirous to know the Lord, and serve him; but being entangled in the Traditions and empty Opinions of Men, are not yet come so far, as I believe the Lord will bring them, as they Regard him by the Arising of his mighty Power in their Hearts; even to the one Shepherd, and one Sheepfold, where, with his People, they will inherit Substance, and the Lord will fill their Treasures. In Page 51. *J. J.* citing my Book, Page 49. thus, *J. H.* having quoted 2 *Joh.* 9, 10. *Whosoever transgresseth and abideth not in the Doctrine of Christ, hath not God. W. W.* in this Text (*i. e.* 2 *Joh.* 9, 10.) "is no ways Applicable to us, for not performing the Baptism of Water, seeing there is no Command from Christ for it, as is abundantly before shewen; but it is very applicable to him and his Brethren, who both break the Command of Christ, and separate from their Brethren, because they
" will

“ will not do so to. For it is evident that Christ, in
 “ *Mat. 5. 34.* Commanded his Followers not to Swear
 “ at all; yet *J. H's* Company separated from *John Hawk-*
 “ *ins's*, and his Adherents, because they would not Swear
 “ and Fight; so they not abiding in the Doctrine of
 “ Christ, may Read their Portion, 2 *Joh. 9, 10.*” (thus
 far *J. J.* cites me) to which he replies, in Page 52.
 thus, “ I have ever had that good Opinion of *W. W.* as
 “ verily to believe that he would not either Say or Write
 “ a Thing, which he knew to be in it self really False;
 “ but here he hath affirmed a Thing of *J. H's* Company,
 “ to be Matter of Fact, which is in every Punctilio there-
 “ of actually False, as I my self certainly know; and if
 “ he did not know it to be False, yet for as much as he did
 “ not know it to be True, (which he could not) certainly
 “ it will be just Cause to impair his Credit for the future,
 “ and of his receiving a sharp Rebuke now.

Answ. Here my Friend *Jenks* would make my Reader
 believe, I was in some notorious Error, in relating that for
 Matter of Fact, of *J. H's* Company, which he says he
 knows is in every punctilio actually False; but in much
 Coolness I may say, my Friend *Jenks*, hath in this Asserti-
 on, exceedingly Injured me; of which I pray God he may
 be made Sensible, and Repent, and be Forgiven: For Ob-
 serve, the first thing I affirmed of *J. H's* Company, was
 that 2 *Joh. 9, 10.* was very applicable to them. and now
 I am put upon it for my own Justification I shall prove it
 is so; for that 2 *Joh. 9, 10.* is Applicable to those who
 break the Command of Christ. The Text is plain, which
 is thus, *whosoever Transgresseth, and abideth not in the*
Doctrine of Christ, hath not God: But they that Swear
 break the Command of Christ, for saith Christ: *Mat. 5.*
34. but I say unto you Swear not at all: But the Baptists
 of *J. H's* and *J. J's* Company do plead for Swearing,
 and also Swear; that they plead for Swearing. *J. J's* own
 Words a little lower are Plain, which are thus, “ the
 “ other Part (*i. e.* *J. H's* Brethren) (of which I was
 “ one) held the taking of an Oath to be Lawfull &c.” And
 that they do Swear, I my self have been a Witness, and
 could

Could mention some of their Brethren, who have Sworn before Magistrates, were it not that I am unwilling to expose any of their Names, who have therein actually broke the Commands of Christ, which I shall omit unless my Friend *Jenks* puts me upon it. From which it plainly appears, that *John Hammett's* Brethren, break the Command of Christ, and therefore, 2 *Joh.* 9. 10, is very Applicable to them; and if so, then what I Asserted of *John Hammett's* Company, is not in every Punctilio False, as *J. J.* hath holdly Affirmed: For the Reader may see what I said is True, in the chiefeft Point of all, and therefore what he adds in Page 52. I conceive better Sutes himself than me, which is thus, "Now it is very certain, that the Spirit of Truth, or Holy Ghost, (the which *W. W.* Boasts of being Baptized with) leads into all Truth, and not into Error and Falsehood; But by what Spirit he was led when he Wrote this I shall not Determine, but leave to Judgment." Near the Bottom of Page 52. *J. J.* says, "He with that Part, (or Company, with which *J. Hammett* is joyned) held the Taking of an Oath to be Lawful, and that from the Command of God, *Deut.* 6. 13. *Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and serve him, and shalt Swear by his Name,* besides many other Scriptures, and that not contrary to the Command of Christ (as *W. W.* suggests) *who came not to destroy the Law, but to fulfil it,* *Mat.* 5. 17. The which the Apostle saith, is Holy, (in the present Tense) *Rom.* 7. 12. and the Commandment Holy, Just, and Good.

Answ. *Deut.* 6. 13. is no Command to Christians, who were by Nature Gentiles, for saith the Apostle, *Rom.* 3. 19. Now we know, that what Things so ever the Law saith, it saith to them who are under the Law: But the Gentiles were never under the *Mosaical* Law, therefore they were never Commanded to Swear by his Name; And as for *J. J.* saying, besides many other Scriptures, and that not contrary to the Command of Christ, (as *W. W.* suggests) surely Swearing under the Gospel, is contrary to the Command of Christ; and no Scripture of the new Testament doth Allow of Swearing.

Swearing amongst Christians; and tho' Christ came not to destroy the Law, but to fulfil it, as he was Made of a Woman made under the Law, to Redeem them that were under the Law, according to *Gal. 4. 45.* yet Christ not only Redeemed them from the Curse of the Law, *Gal. 3. 13.* but also delivered them from the Law it self, according to *Rom. 7. 4, 6.* And what tho' the Apostle saith, the Law is Holy, and the Command Holy, Just, and Good; if *J. J.* understands this to be the *Mosaical Law*, the *Jews* were then Redeemed from it, and the *Gentiles* were never under it, as hath been fully proved: And I cannot but Admire, that any who believe the Scriptures, and the Christian Religion, should find fault with us, for not using Water Baptism, which they neither have, nor ever can prove, to be a Command of Christ; while they not only break the plain and positive Command of Christ in Swearing, but also plead for it; surely such have not duly Considered and laid to Heart the following Scriptures, *Mar. 7. 8, 9.* *For laying aside the Commandment of God, ye hold the Traditions of Men, as the Washing of Pots and Cups, and many other such like Things ye do. And he said unto them, full well ye reject the Commandment of God, that ye may keep your own Traditions.* *1 Cor. 7. 19.* *Circumcision is Nothing, and Uncircumcision is Nothing, but the keeping the Commandments of God.* In Page 53. *J. J.* proceeds, " But the event (*viz.* of the Baptist's difference) was such, that *John Hawkins*, and several with him, separated themselves from us, and not we from them, as *W. W.* has untruly declared: And as to Fighting, I do not Remember it was once in Debate; but for the Readers better Satisfaction herein they may hear what *John Hawkins*, and *Deacon James King* (who separated with him) say to what I asserted on this Head, which is as followeth. *We whose Names are here unto Subscribed, do Declare, that what our Brother J. J. hath Written in Answer to W. W. saying, J. H's Company separated from John Hawkins and his Adherents, because they would not Swear and Fight, is Truth, and that Division or Separation is healed*

Answer

Ans. As to what I have said, in my former Book, Page 49. that *Hammett &c.* separated from *Hawkins*, It was according to the Apprehension and Information I had of that Matter; however I shall not Dispute which Party it was that separated, but think it would have been more to *J. J.* and his Party's Reputation, to let it pass as I had represented it; for I cannot think it is for the Credit of *J. Hammett*, and his Company, to publish to the World, that they suffered *J. Hawkins, &c.* who refused all Swearing, to separate from them on that Account, rather than by their keeping to the plain and positive Doctrine of Christ, (SWEAR NOT AT ALL) not to have given them Occasion so to do. In Page 55. 56. *J. J.* says, " but I having recited Some of *W. W.*'s self " Contradictions, in the former Part of my Writing, shall " now mention one more, and so conclude the first Part " of my Reply. In his 8th Page he says, but farther if I " should grant, (which I see no Reason to do) that Christ " Commanded them (*viz.* his Disciples) to Baptize with " Water, before he was Offered up, (to put an End to " the Dispensation of the Law) I cannot see how that " would make any Thing for Water Baptism, any more " than his commanding *Peter* and *John*, *Luk.* 22. 8. to " go and prepare the Passover (so reciting the whole Pas- " sage) would perpetuate the Use of the Paschal Lamb, " or Passover to us under the Gospel); from whence it ap- " pears, says *J. J.* that the most genuine Consequence, " deducive from this Assertion of his is, that whatsoever " Christ Commanded, before he was offered up, is no " ways binding on us under the Gospel; and yet in his " 49th Page he accuses *J. H.*'s Company with Transgress- " ing and Breaking the Command of Christ, *Mat.* 5. 34. " But I say unto you, Swear not all, because they held the " Taking of an Oath to be Lawful, when Lawfully called " thereunto; and yet this Command was before Christ " was Offered up, as well as the other; whence " it is clear, that those Commands which Christ gave " forth, before his Suffering, are of some Value with

"W. W. where they suit his Opinion, but where they
 "thwart it, they are of no Value at all.

Ans. Whether my Friend *Jenks*, makes out my self
 Contradiction here, as he terms it, I shall leave to the
 Judgment of my Reader, when I have shew'n how unfair-
 ly and disingenuously he hath done by me in his Inferences;
 he would there insinuate as tho' the genuine Consequence
 of my Assertion was, that whatsoever Christ Commanded
 before he was offered up, is no way binding on us under the
 Gospel; a greater Mistake I think he could not be guilty of;
 for tho' I said that if I should grant that Christ Command-
 ed his Disciples to Baptize with Water, before he was
 Offered up, I could not see how that would make any
 Thing for Water Baptism, any more than his Command-
 ing *Peter* and *John* to prepare the Passover, &c. would
 perpetuate the Passover under the Gospel; yet to shew
 that I did not intend by my Writing that what Christ
 then Commanded his Disciples to practise, (before he
 was Offered up) was not binding on us under the Gospel,
 when we have a Command from him so to do. I then
 added in the Lines following those *J. J.* hath cited thus,
 " But if any should object and say, the Latter was
 " Commanded under the Law (*i. e.* the Passover) but
 " the former was not (*i. e.* Water Baptism) to which I
 " answered, alltho' that would be to beg the Question,
 " yet for the Information of Such, I shall shew; that he
 " Commanded his Apostles and that in the Discharge of
 " the Ministry, (even that which was no express Command
 " under the Law) which is no way binding on Gospel
 " Ministers in our Days, See *Mat. 10. 5. These Twelve*
 " *Jesus sent forth, and Commanded them, saying, go not*
 " *in the Way of the Gentiles, and into any City of the Sa-*
 " *maritans enter ye not.* From whence all that have Ears to
 " Hear, and Hearts to Understand, may Learn, that what
 " Christ commanded his Disciples to be actually found in
 " the Practice of, IN SOME CASES, before he was
 " offered up a Sacrifice for the Sins of the whole World,
 " is no way binding on us, without we have a Com-
 " mand from him so to do, which for Water Baptism we
 " have

“ have not. ” From whence it is plain, I only said, that in **SOME CASES**, what Christ commanded his Disciples to be found in the Practice of, before he was offered up, &c. is not binding on us under the Gospel; and that those Cases were such, which we have no Command from Christ to practise the same, as the Passover and the like; but against Swearing at all, we have the Command of Christ, *Mat. 5. 34.* **BUT I SAY UNTO YOU, SWEAR NOT AT ALL.** From these Premisses duly considered, there is no Reason to conclude there is any Contradiction, in these two Passages in my Book; but I am pleased my Friend *Jenks* finds it clear, that those Commands which Christ gave forth before his Suffering, are of some Value with *W. W.* when they sute his Opinion; and I can in much Sincerity say, that all the Commands of Christ, (which are for his Followers to observe) sute with my Opinion, and none of them Thwart it, as he uncharitably Suggests. In Page 56. *J. J.* says, “ thus “ I have made some brief Reply, to the Principal Heads “ of *W. W.*’s Arguments against Christ’s Ordinance of Water Baptism; and as I believe truly, according to the “ Mind of God, and have therein plainly shewed, that “ the Baptizing which Christ commanded his Disciples, “ in *Mat. 28. 19.* to administer, was, and is, Water “ Baptism, and not the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, as “ *W. W.* contrary to the Scripture, would perswade his “ Reader to Believe.

Ans. That I advanced any Argument against Christ’s Ordinance of Water Baptism, I deny, and Challenge *J. J.* to prove I had, or else own he hath exceedingly abused me, in suggesting as tho’ I argued against an Ordinance of Christ, which blessed be God, I have hitherto been preserved from, and trust in the Lord I shall, to my Lives End. But here my Friend *Jenks* begs the Question (for want, as I conceive, of Argument, to prove it,) (*i. e.*) that Water Baptism was an Ordinance of Christ, but that I Deny, and again assert as I did in my Answer to *J. Hammett*, that Water Baptism is never called in the Holy Scriptures, an Ordinance of Christ, and how far *J. J.*

hath shewed that the Baptizing Christ Commanded, *Mat.* 28. 19. was, and is, Water Baptism, and not the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, I willingly leave to the enlightened Readers Judgment, whom I desire to observe, that tho' Water Baptism is abundantly mentioned in the Scriptures of the New Testament, yet it is not in any of them called the Baptism of Christ, or Christ's Baptism, but it is often called (and that properly) *John's* Baptism, or the Baptism of *John*; neither do we find that any of the Apostles, ever used the Form, in *Mat.* 28. 19. when they Baptized with Water, which 'tis highly Reasonable to conclude, they would always have observed the Form there Commanded, had they Baptized with Water, by Vertue of that Commission; but the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, is in a particular manner applied to Christ, to distinguish it from Water Baptism, by *John the Baptist*, viz. *I indeed Baptize you with WATER unto Repentance, but he that cometh after me, is mightier than I, whose Shoes I am not worthy to bear, he shall Baptize you with the HOLY GHOST, and with Fire.* From whence it is clear, that Water Baptism was *John's*, and not Christ's; and that spiritual Baptism, or the Baptism of the Spirit, was, and is, Christ's, and not *John's*; and therefore to me, it is beyond all Doubt, when Christ Commanded his Disciples *Mat.* 28. 19. to go Teach all Nations, Baptizing them into the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost; he had Relation solely to his own Baptism, which is absolutely Necessary to all true *Christians* unto Salvation, (for by it we are all Baptized into the Church, according to *1 Cor.* 12. 13.) and not by *John's* Water Baptism, which at best was but a Type, and therefore did never appertain to the Church of the new Testament. And as for that weak and absurd Argument, that tho' Christ hath Power to Baptize with the Spirit, yet he never gave that Power to Man, no not to his Ministers, to Baptize with the Spirit, it's easily Answered, that Christ having all Power in Heaven and Earth given unto him, he Commanded (his Ministers) to Teach all Nations Baptizing them into the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and promised to be with them to the

the End of the World, yea saith he, *Job. 20. 21. As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And he Breathed on them and said unto them, receive ye the Holy Ghost,* which in due Time they did, whereby they became able Ministers of the Spirit unto others, and Instrumental in the Lord's Hand, in turning many from Darknes unto Light, and from the Power of Satan to God. And thus through the Gospel Ministry, they instrumentally Baptized them with the Holy Spirit into the Church of Christ; for none can be truly said to be turned from Darknes to Light, and from the Power of Satan to God, who are not Members of that Body, of which Christ is Head, neither can any be Members of that Body, but those who are Baptized into it by one Spirit; and therefore if the Apostles and Ministers did turn Men from Darknes to Light, and from the Power of Satan to God, (as is clear Instrumentally they did) then they also Baptized them by the one Holy Spirit, into that Body of which Christ is Head, where they dayly Partake of all the Promises of God, for they are Yea, and Amen, in Christ, throughout all Generations. Again, in Page 56. *J. J.* boldly saith, " But *W. W.* having drawn his Sword " to Fight against Christ's Ordinances, is minded to have " a Stroak at the Lord's Supper, as well as at Water Baptism, before he puts it up.

Ans. What *J. J.* means by drawing my Sword I am not certain, for I have used no Material one for upwards of Twenty Years; and if he means my Pen, I can in much Sincerity say, that I never drew that, or made Use of It, either to Fight or Write, against any Ordinance of Christ; but on the Contrary, I wrote solely for the Doctrine of Christ, and against the Opposers thereof; and as for his saying, I have a Mind to have a Stroak at the Lord's Supper, before I put up my Sword, I Answer, that there is no Scripture that calls the Passover, or what Christ Eat with his Disciples at the Passover, the Lord's Supper, or an Ordinance of Christ, but those Names, **LORD'S SUPPER, ORDINANCES OF CHRIST** were appropriated to it, in the dark Night of Apostacy, and therefore if I Write against them, I do no more than

than is the Duty of a true Christian ; but perhaps some Bigott, to Tradition, may Object, and say, doth not the Apostle call it the Lord's Supper, in 1 Cor. 11. 20. where he says, *when ye come together therefore into one Place, this is not to Eat the Lord's Supper* : To which I Answer, the Apostle doth not only in this Place not call it the Lord's Supper, but also plainly intimates that Eating, in Remembrance of Christ's Death, was not the Lord's Supper, for the proper Way (if there was any such Thing as a proper Way) of Eating, in Remembrance of Christ's Death, was when they come together into one Place, but he lets them know when they so came together, this is not to Eat the Lord's Supper or as in the Margin, ye cannot Eat the Lord's Supper ; from whence it is clear and plain, that the Apostle distinguishes between Eating in Remembrance of Christ's Death, and the Lord's Supper, in which he shews their so Eating in Remembrance of Christ's Death, was not the Lord's Supper. In Page 58. *J. J.* proceeds, " but I shall not Trouble my self to reply to all that he " (*i. e. W. W.*) says on that Foot ; but I shall according " to the small Ability given me, proceed in order, to " prove that the Supper which we call the Lord's Sup- " per, was a Supper distinct from the Passover; and also " that it is to be partook of by the Churches of Christ, " untill his second personal Coming. And first that it was " a Supper distinct from That of the Passover, see Mat. " 26. 26. *And as they were Eating, Jesus took Bread and " Blessed it and brake it, and gave to his Disciples, and " said, Take, Eat, this is my Body. Verse 27. And he " took the Cup and gave Thanks, and gave it to them, say- " ing, Drink ye all of it, for this is my Blood of the New " Testament which is shed for many for the Remission of " Sins. Luk. 22. 17. And he took the Cup and gave " Thanks, and said, Take this and divide it among your " selves, Verse 18. for I say unto you, I will not Drink " of the Fruit of the Vine, untill the Kingdom of God " shall come. Verse 19. And he took Bread and gave " Thanks, and Brake it, and gave it unto them, saying, " this is my Body which is given for you, this do in Re-
membrance*

* *membrance of me. Verse 20. Likewise he took the Cup,*
 “ *after Supper, saying, this Cup is the New Testament in*
 “ *my Blood, which is shed for you.*

Answ. I have cited him so far *Verbatim*, to shew my Readers, that there's not one Syllable of Proof, from one End of it to the Other, to prove what he asserts, he will prove by it, *viz.* that what they call the Lord's Supper was a Supper Distinct from the Passover; but every one which will believe *Mat.* who was then with Christ at the Passover, (and an Eye and Eare Witness to what was done) may be fully Assured that it was the Passover, and nothing else that he Eat with his Disciples, for which take his own Words, *Mat.* 26. 19, 20, 21. *And the Disciples did as Jesus appointed them, and they made ready the Passover; now when the even was come, he sat down with the Twelve, and as they Eat, he said, &c. Verse 26. and as they were Eating, (mark as they were Eating and not afterwards) Jesus took Bread, and Blessed it, and Break it, and gave it to the Disciples, and said, Take, Eat, this is my Body, Verse 27, 28. And he took the Cup and gave Thanks, and gave it unto them, Saying, Drink ye all of it, for this is my Blood of the new Testament, which is shed for many for the Remission of Sins.* From whence it is clear, as any Thing the Evangelist wrote can be in my Judgment, that it was nothing else but the Passover; for he doth not say as *J. J.* doth, that the Supper of the Passover was ended, and then *Jesus took Bread, &c.* But on the Contrary he saith, as they were Eating the Passover, (and not afterwards) *Jesus took Bread, &c.* so that they never stop'd or left of, after they began, untill they had Eaten, what he there called his Body, from whence it is Manifest, the whole was but one Supper, and no more, and that one Supper was the Passover, and *Mark* follows *Mathew* in chap. 14. 18. to 25. directly *Verbatim*, so that he fully Witnesseth, the Whole of what *Mathew* hath said, on that Head; which two Witnesses, I hope may be of Sufficient Credit, to Confirm what I have said; and by their Writing is fully Proved, the Premisses considered, it must be allowed, that

that by Clear Scripture Proof I Conceive I have gained this Argument, that the Disciples Eat no other Supper, but the Passover, the Night they Eat it, and Consequently that Christ that Night gave forth no new Ordinance or Institution, but only Eat the Passover with his Disciples as a *Jew*, and informed them of its right Use, which was to point to him, the Antitype; so that *J. J.*'s Assertion that the Supper, which they called the Lord's Supper, was a Supper distinct from the Passover, falls to the Ground for Want of Proof also, because it is directly contrary to the afore mentioned Texts, of *Mathew* and *Mark*: And I can but observe, that my Friend *Jenks*, in Page 59. twice over calls that Discourse Christ had with his Disciples, *Matt*: 26. 20. to 26. a large Discourse, which makes me Remember the common Maxim; that sinking men lay hold on Straws, tho' to no purpose, as my Friend *Jenks* hath here done; for upon a Deliberate Reading I don't find it takes up one Minutes Time, by my Watch: and therefore, I cannot think any considerate Man (except such a one who manages a sinking Cause) can truly call what did not take up one Minute in delivering a large Discourse. In Page 60. and 61. *J. J.* proceeds, "asserting that this Supper was not the Passover, nor yet
 "to terminate at Christ's Spiritual coming to his Saints,
 "is yet farther Manifest; for his Disciples are Command-
 "ed to do it; now were it the Passover, and to cease at
 "his Spiritual Coming, his Disciples could not do it at all,
 "for the Passover was to be Eat but once in the Year,
 "and then on the fourteenth Day of the first Month, in
 "the Evening; and there was but about fifty three Days
 "from the Time of giving forth this Command, to the
 "Time of *Pentecost*, when the Disciples received the Ho-
 "ly Ghost, which was Christ's spiritual Coming to them;
 "so that if *W. W.*'s. Argument were True, that this
 "Supper was the Passover, and to cease at Christ's spiri-
 "tual Coming, the Disciples had no Time allowed them
 "to partake of it, and yet they were Commanded to
 "do it.

Answer

Answ. Here my Opponent Thinks he has got me in such a Dilemma that I cannot get out, because the Disciples, according to me, are commanded to do it, (*i. e.* eat the Passover, in Remembrance of Christ); and Christ being Spiritually come, before another Year came about, they therefore had no Time allowed to perform what they were commanded; therefore *W. W.* must be in the Wrong, in what he hath asserted: But perhaps my Friend *Jenks* forgot that they had then Time to perform it, when Christ commanded them to do that in Remembrance of him, surely they were then Eating the Passover, and therefore had Time allowed them at that very Instant, to perform what Christ commanded them; but he never commanded them to do the like the ensuing Year; much less to perform it Yearly to the End of the World, or till Christ should come to Judgment; such Whims, I conceive, were brought forth in the dark Night of Ignorance and Apostacy; but tho' there was no Command for its Continuance, yet the Apostle might permit the weak and carnal *Corinthians* to Practise it, in this their weak and childish State, as he also condescended to the weak in Circumcising *Timothy*, and to be at Charges with them, who had a Vow on them, untill an offering should be offered for every one of them; these Things were done without any Command from Christ, as was *Paul's* permitting the weak *Corinthians*, to Eat in Remembrance of Christ's Death. In Page 62. 63. *J. J.* saith, " I observe that the same Lord that died, the same Lord's Death is shewed (by this Memorial) till the same Lord come; and the Lord which suffered Death, was the Man Christ Jesus, who rose again from the Dead, and ascended up into Heaven, and shall so in like manner come again, it is this same he, that the Text hath reference to, where it says, till he come, and must be so understood, or else it may be any other he, which would render the wise Apostle's Words, to be unintelligible, and to have no Certainty in them; but the contrary thereof is manifest, and his Words are certain, for he spake by the Spirit of God; from whence it is

“ as clear as the Light, that it is the second Personal
 “ coming of the Lord, which the Apostle has reference
 “ to, when he says, *ye shew the Lord's Death till he come.*

Ans. Here my Opponent hath taken a great Deal of Pains to divide Christ, and to make the Man Christ Jesus, who suffered for the Sins of the World, without the Gates of *Jerusalem*, and Christ in the *Gentiles*, the Hope of Glory two Christ's, or else all his Labour in this Place is of no Signification; for Christ is not divided, but is the same Yesterday, to Day, and for Ever. *Heb.* 13. 8. And it is the same Christ, and the same Lord, who was put to Death in the Flesh, and quickened by the Spirit, that *Paul* in *1 Cor.* 15. 45. calls the last Adam (which saith he) *was made a quickening Spirit*; and in Verse 47. *the second Man is the Lord from Heaven*; from whence I observe, that the same Lord who was put to Death in the Flesh, and quickened by the Spirit, whose Death the *Corinthians* shewed when they Eat in Remembrance of him, is the very same Lord, and no other, whom *Paul* in *1 Cor.* 15. 47. calls the Lord from Heaven who is a quickening Spirit, Verse 45. and it is the same he, and not another, that the Apostle in *1 Cor.* 11. 26. hath relation to, when he saith, *ye do shew the Lord's Death till he come*: Which coming is Spiritual, the Lord from Heaven, the quickening Spirit; and as for his mentioning here and in divers other Places, of his Book, Christ (or the Lord's) second personal coming, that is meant in *1 Cor.* 11. 26. and in *Heb.* 9. 28. &c. I may say once for all, that the Holy Scriptures from one End to the other, are altogether Silent of any such Coming, and therefore it deserves no other Answer than to be Denied as Unscriptural, consequently remains for him to prove. In Page 63. *F. F.* proceeds saying, “ the Lord
 “ Jesus, when he gave forth the Command to his Disci-
 “ ples, to do this in Remembrance of himself, gave it
 “ forth without Limitation of Time, he reserving that
 “ in his own Power; and why *W. W.* should take upon
 “ himself to limit the Duration of Christ's Ordinance, I

“ know

" know not, unless it were to shew his Presumption
 " which he hath effected.

Ans. W. W. hath never taken upon himself to limit Christ's Ordinance, as *J. J.* suggests, for he never allowed it to be any more than the Passover; (therefore not Christ's Ordinance) and my saying Christ's spiritual Coming to his People, was its Antitype to them; and that therefore it was to cease in Point of Obligation, when he was so come, was no more than what *Paul's* Words imply, in *1 Cor. 11. 26.* in the afore cited 63d Page of my Friend *Jenks's* Book, he saith, " When he (*i. e.* the Lord Jesus) gave forth the Commaud to his Disciples, to do " this in Remembrance of himself, he gave it forth without Limitation of Time, he reserving that in his own " Power; " to which I Answer, then it was not according to this Confession, to continue a standing Ordinance in the Church, until Christ's second Personal coming, as *J. J.* hath many Times asserted; nor yet to remain to all future Ages of the Church; but Christ having reserved the Time of its Continuance in his own Power, might at his Pleasure in a few Weeks, put an End to it, and bring his People to its Antitype, to wit himself, in his spiritual Appearance, that by Feeding ~~on~~ him the true Bread, their Souls might be nourished up to eternal Life; and how doth my Friend *Jenks* know, (seeing as afore it was not limited by Christ, when he gave that Command to continue any certain Time in the Church, he reserving the Time of its continuance in his own Power) but this of the Putting an end to the Passover, and bringing his Disciples and Followers to the Substance, together with putting an End to the outward Circumcision, and bringing his People to the inward, were not Some of those many Things Christ said in *Joh. 15. 12.* he had yet to say to his Disciples, which they were not then able to bear, Verse 11. *Howbeit, when the Spirit of Truth is come, he shall Guide you into all Truth.* This was to be followed not only then, but now also; and we cannot but magnify Almighty God, through his Son our Lord Jesus Christ, who by this Spirit of Truth, opened our Intellects, to understand

derstand the Scriptures, and to see clearly betwixt the Traditions of Men, and the Command of Christ, and to leave the First, and cleave close to the Last, as that in which our present and eternal Peace doth consist. Near the Foot of Page 63. " *J. J.* finds great Fault with me, " for calling the State of the *Corinthians*, when they " might be born with, in their Eating in Remembrance of " Christ's Death, &c. their Weak and Childish State; " and yet says he in Page 36. of *W. W's* Book, he says, " they were Baptized with the Holy Ghost, and there- " fore thinks I have contradicted my self. " To which I Reply, *First*, that the *Corinthian* Church, at the Time when *Paul* wrote his first Epistle to them, was in a Weak and Childish State, I suppose will not be Denied; but if it should, it is easily proved by *Paul*, 1 Cor. 3. 1, 23. And I Brethren, would not speak unto you as unto Spiritual, but as unto Carnal, even as unto Babes in Christ; I have Fed you with Milk and not with Meat, for hitherto ye were not able to bear it, neither yet are ye able, for ye are yet Carnal, consequently not spiritual. Chap. 5. 1. 2. It is reported commonly, that there is Fornication amongst you, and such Fornication as is not so ~~at~~ much Named amongst the Gentiles, that one should have his Fathers Wife; and ye are puffed up, and have not rather Mourned, that he that hath done this Deed, might be taken away from amongst you. Chap. 11. 17, 18. Now in this that I declare unto you, I Praise you not, that you come together not for the better, but for the worse; for first of all, when ye come together in the Church, I here that there be Divisions among you, and I partly believe it. Doth it not hence appear they were in a Weak and Childish State, tho' some of the same Church at *Corinth* were Baptized with the Holy Ghost, (for I never said they universally were) is clear from the same Text, in 1 Cor. 6. 11. And such were some of you, but ye are Washed, (or Baptized) but ye are Sanctified, but ye are Justified in the Name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God; and yet I have no way contradicted my self, as my Friend *Jenks* might have seen, if he had considered what I said in Page 60. thus, " For the *Corinthians* (what- soever

" soever some of them might have attained) in a general
 " way had not so received Christ, (*i. e.* in his spiritual
 " coming) and therefore they were exhorted 1 Cor. 1. 7.
 " 8. *To wait for that Coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, to*
 " *confirm them unto the End, that they might be blameless*
 " *in the Day (or coming to Judgment) of our Lord Jesus*
 " *Christ.* " From whence it is apparent by the Parenthe-
 sis, that I did not Deny but that some of the *Corinthians*,
 (such as the Apostle saith were Baptized, Sanctified, and
 Justified, &c.) might have received Christ in his Spiritu-
 al Appearance, so that I have neither contradicted the
 Scriptures, nor my self. In Answer to me, Page 61. 62.
 where I argued, that 1 Cor. 10. 16, 21. had no relation
 to that Ceremony of Eating outward Bread, and drinking
 Wine, &c. J. J. replies in Page 68. " Notwithstanding
 " all he has said, it is very clear to all who will be Wise
 " for themselves, that this Text has a particular relation
 " to the Ordinance of the Lord's Supper; for when Paul
 " says, *The Bread which we Break, is it not the Communi-*
 " *on of the Body of Christ*; it is very certain that Paul and
 " the *Corinthians*, broke that very Bread which he says,
 " *is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ*; and there-
 " fore this very Bread which they Break, must either be
 " the material Bread made Use of in the Ordina-
 " nance of the Lord's Supper, or else it must be
 " the real Body of Christ which they Break; but that
 " the real Body of Christ is, or ever was, broke by Paul,
 " or any other of the Children of God to Feed upon, is,
 " and ever was denied by all, professing Christianity,
 " (that I have heard of) except the *Papists*, and now
 " W. W. But it is very certain, that the Bread mention-
 " ed in this Text to be broken) is the material Bread,
 " which after the Giving of Thanks is Broke and Partook
 " of in the Ordinance of the Lord's Supper.

Ans. First, my Friend *Jenks* is mistaken, in saying
 Paul and the *Corinthians* break that very Bread which he
 says, *Is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ*; for in
 a strict Sense it was Paul and *Sosthenes* who broke the
 Bread, who were the Authors of that Epistle; and in a
 more

more extensive Sense, it was *Paul* and all the Apostles and Eminent Ministers of the Gospel, whom *Paul* speaks of here in the Plural. Secondly, The Bread which they did break (spoken of 1 Cor. 10. 16) is no where in Holy Writ, said to be material Bread, Partook of in the Ordinance of the Lord's Supper, as *J. Jenks* hath asserted, tho' not offered to prove. And Thirdly and Lastly, there is no necessity to conclude as *J. J.* doth, that this very Bread which they did break, must be the material Bread made Use of in the Ordinance of the Lord's Supper, or else it must be the real Body of Christ which they did break, &c. For why may it not be understood, to be that Bread Christ speaks of, *Joh. 6. 51.* where he saith of himself, *I am the living Bread which came down from Heaven; if any Man Eat of this Bread he shall live for ever, and the Bread that I will give is my Flesh, which I will give for the Life of the World.* Now this Bread which came down from Heaven, was neither material Bread, nor yet the real Body of Christ, (if by the real Body of Christ be meant that Body which suffered Death without the Gates of *Jerusalem*) and was raised for that was taken of the Virgin, but it was the quickening Spirit of Christ, as is clear from *John 6. 63.* for upon Christ's saying he was the living Bread, which came down from Heaven, and the Bread, which he would give, was his Flesh, &c. not only the *Jews* strove amongst themselves, Verse 52. saying, *how can this Man give us his Flesh to Eat,* but also many of his Disciples when they heard this, (Verse 60.) said, *This is a hard saying, who can hear it;* upon which Christ said, Verse 61. 62. 63. *Doth this offend you, what if you should see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before; it is the Spirit that quickeneth, the Flesh profiteth nothing; the Words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit, and they are Life.* From whence it is, (I hope) clear to all, that are grown in the Christian Religion, that the quickening Spirit of Christ is that Bread which came down, which he gave for the Life of the World; and as *Paul* with his Companions in the Gospel Ministry, Preached and Prayed in the Evidence and Demonstration of the Spirit and Power of Christ,

Christ, and thereby were made able Ministers of the Spirit to others, as to the *Samaritans*, *Ephesians*, and to *Timothy*, they might be said to break or dispense that Bread which is the Spirit, as the Communion of the Body of Christ; for tho' they were many, yet by Partaking of that one Bread which comes from Heaven, (whether Communicated immediately by Christ, or instrumentally by his Apostles and Ministers) they all were made one Bread, and one Body, and enjoyed the Communion of the Holy Spirit together, in the Shining forth of the Gospel Light, unto the perfect Day of God. But *J. J.* in Page 69. 70. says, " that both *W. W.* in his Book, and *Lawford Godfrey* " in the Preface, seemingly held, that the Ordinance spoken of *Col. 1. 14, 20, 21, 28.* were such as God had Commanded in the Law given to *Israel*; but I am (says he) " of a contrary Mind, for I take those mentioned in the 14 " Verse only to be such, but those mentioned in the other " three Verses, I take to have relation only to such Ordinances as proceeded merely from Commands and Traditions of Men.

Ans. That *Col. 1. 14, 21, 22.* have relation to such Ordinances as were a Shadow of Things to come, of which Christ was the Substance, is clear from Verse 17. but that such Ordinances, or Traditions, were a Shadow of Christ, which were in their first Institution the Tradition of Men, I Deny, and therefore *Col. 1. 14, 20, 21, 22.* related to such Ordinances as were once a Shadow or Type of Christ to come, but now he being come, and having spoiled Principalities and Powers, and Triumphed over them in himself, and put an end to Shadows, Types and Figures, by the Sacrifices of himself once for all; and by the Work of his blessed Spirit, having brought the *Colossians* to be complete in him, they were now forbid by the Apostle to Touch, or Taste, or Handle, which said he, all are to Perish with the using. But *J. J.* proceeds in Page 70. thus, " But if it should be granted, that those Ordinances " were the same with them mentioned in the 14 Verse, " read blotting out the Hand Writing of Ordinances that " was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it " out.

“ out of the Way, nailing it to his Cross. Then I say,
 “ that when *W. W.* or his Friend *Lawford Godfrey*,
 “ who wrote those large Encomiums upon his Book, as
 “ well as upon the *Quakers* Opinion, have proved that
 “ the Ordinances of Water Baptism and the Lord's Sup-
 “ per, were contained in Hand Writing, at the Time of
 “ Christ's suffering, and so nailed to his Cross. Then
 “ we may have Cause further, to consider their Argu-
 “ ments against them, but 'till then, both *W. W.* his said
 “ Friend, and all other *Quakers*, ought with great Shame
 “ and Confusion of Face, to forbear teaching and publish-
 “ ing their Pamphlets against them; and in the mean Time
 “ we have great Cause to bless God, for the Consolation
 “ and Soul-refreshing Comfort which we are made Partak-
 “ ers of in the Enjoyment of them.

Ans. I can easily prove from *Exod.* 12. 3. &c. that
 the Ordinance of the Passover, miscalled by *J. Jenks* and
 many others, the Ordinance of the Lord's Supper, was in
 Hand Writing at the Time of Christ's Suffering, and there-
 fore nailed to his Cross; but neither I nor my Friend *Lawford*
Godfrey, have said, that Water Baptism was one of those
 Ordinances mentioned in *Col.* 1. 14. to the End; and yet
 inasmuch as Water Baptism was at best, but a Shadow of
 the Baptism of Christ with the Holy Spirit, who is the
 Substance, it must, and did, give way and Decrease, as
 Christ comes to take Place, and Increase; and therefore
 the Apostle says to the Believers, *There is one Lord, one*
Faith, and one Baptism, which must be understood of the
 Baptism of the Spirit, by which the whole Church were
 Baptized into one Body. But why *W. W.* and *Lawford*
Godfrey, and all the *Quakers*, ought with Shame and Con-
 fusion of Face forbear Preaching and Publishing their
 Pamphlets against them, (*i. e.* Water Baptism and the
Jewish Passover, miscalled the Lord's Supper) I know not,
 unless it be that *J. Jenks*, with his Brethren, may go
 on without Controul, grasping at the Shadow, while they
 neglect the Substance; but whether my Friend *Jenks* be
 pleased or not, we knowing from the Revelation of the
 Spirit of God, that both the Passover and Water Baptism,
 are

are ceased in Point of Obligation; and also having the Testimony of the Holy Scriptures of the new Testament, full and clear on our Side, (as the preceeding Sheets, as well as my former Book, in my Opinion, fully manifest) and being also called of God, both to Preach and Write, for the eternal Good of Mankind; we can't but as much as in us lieth, both by Words and Writing, sound forth the glad Tidings of Salvation, in the Name and Spirit of our Lord Jesus Christ; whose divine and quickening Power and Life, we feel, in the Discharge of our Duty, to constrain us to turn (all that receive our Ministry) from the Shadows, and Types, and Figures, to the Substance, Christ in them the Hope of Glory; and whatever we are called by ignorant Men, yet in much Humility and Christian Courage, we can say of the Gospel, which Christ hath given us to Preach, as *Paul* did, we are not Ashamed of the Gospel of Christ. For it is the Power of God unto Salvation, to every one that Believeth, for therein (*i. e.* in the Gospel Power) is the Righteousness of God revealed from Faith to Faith; and my Spirit at this Time, being touched with a Degree of the Power of God's Love, in Jesus Christ, unto Mankind, can do no other than intreat, in Bowels of tender Compassion, that all that Read this, may wait to have their Minds turned to the divine Light, and Spirit of Christ, in themselves; that thereby they may know the Root of the corrupt Tree, or carnal Mind, to be taken away, and thus Witness the Law of the Spirit of Life, in Christ Jesus, to make them Free from the Law of Sin and Death, that their Souls may inherit Substance, yea durable Riches and Righteousness; and that the Lord may fill their Treasures with divine Life, and Heavenly sweetness, while in this World, and the Seal of the Holy Spirit, as an Assurance of eternal Life in that which is to come. Thus Christian Reader, with a Salutation of indeared Love, do I at this Time take my Leave of Thee, and bid thee Farewell in the Lord.

P O S T S C R I P T.

WHEREAS J. J. hath in Page 59 and 60. taken upon him to Assert, that the Disciples Eat two Suppers the Night of the Passover, the First of which, he allows to be the Passover, and to satisfy the bodily Appetite, but the last he says was a Supper distinct from the Passover; which last Supper according to him, was Commanded to be observed as an Ordinance during the Time of Christ's personal Absence. But that the Reader may be informed, that there was nothing done by Christ at that last Passover he Eat with his Disciples, but what was the usual Practice of the *Jews*, at their Passover, from Year to Year; I have transcribed a passage out of *Tho. Ellwood's Sacred History*, Page 245. to 247. where he cites *Samuel Cradock's Harmony of the four Evangelists*, Chap. 6. Sect. 1. giving Account of the manner of the *Jewish* Celebration of the 'Passover, as (says he) 'it is delivered by their own Writers,' omitting only such Parts or Passages as are not directly pertinent to the present Occasion: Thus he begins, take the whole Quotation.

1. 'When all things appertaining to the Feast were prepared, and all Persons that belonged to that Company ready; the Chief Man of the Company — takes a Cup of Wine, and blesteth it in some such Words as these: Blessed be thou, O Lord, who hast created the Fruit of the Vine, &c.

2. 'The Table was then furnished with Provisions of several Sorts, viz. *Bitter Herbs, Unleavened Bread*, the Body of the Paschal Lamb *roasted whole*. The latter *Jews* added, it seems, of their own Heads, a Dish of *thick Sauce*, called *Charoseth*, made of Dates, Figs, Raisins, and Vinegar mingled together (which was not commanded in the Law) as a *Memorial* to them of the Clay, in which their Fathers laboured (to make Bricks) in the Land of *Egypt*.

3. 'The

Chief Man of the Company takes the four
 blesses them, &c. And eats thereof the
 of an *Olive*, and distributes to the rest, &c.
 Then he takes the Dish or Charger, which held
 unleavened Bread or Cakes, and (laying by a piece
 Unleavened Cake, to be taken afterwards with
 the Paschal Lamb, at the Close of the Supper) he bless-
 es the Bread in such Words as these; Blessed art thou,
 O Lord, who bringest forth Bread out of the Earth,
 &c. Then he breaks it, and eats of it.

5. ' When this is finished, he begins the *Second Cup*
 of Wine, and the rest follow him. Then *Children* used
 to be brought in, and were made to ask, What is the
 Reason this Night differs so much from other Nights?
 instancing in many Particulars of the Festival Solemn-
 ities. Then the Master of the Feast begins a Narrative,
 or Discourse, How they were all *Servants in Egypt*; and
 as that Night God redeemed them, &c. . This kind of
 Declaration, or shewing forth the Occasion of the Pass-
 over, and God's wonderful Goodness to them in their De-
 liverance, they call *Haggadah*. Hence the Apostle may
 be supposed to have borrowed his Phrase, As often as ye
 shall Eat this Bread, and Drink this Cup, ye declare, or
 shew forth the Lord's Death, 1 Cor. 11. 26. This *An-*
nuntiation, or shewing forth to their Children, the
 Lord's Wonderful Goodness and Mercy, we find com-
 manded, *Exod.* 12. 26. 27. and *Chap.* 3. 8.

6. ' Then he takes that Part of the Unleavened Cake,
 that was laid aside before, and Blessing it, and giving
 Thanks for it as before, he distributes to *every one* a
 Piece to eat with the Paschal Lamb: of which each
 Person was bound to eat as much as the Quantity of an
 Olive at least.

' The Breaking of Bread therefore, at which our Savi-
 our did institute the Commemoration of his Body, seems
 to be this *Second* Breaking of Bread, viz. in time of
 Supper (for it is said ἐδίουσαν αὐτῶν, as they were Eating)
 or towards the End of Supper. For after this, nothing
 more was to be eaten that Night.

7. ' All

7. "All this done, they drink up the *Third Cup*,
 " Blessing or thanksgiving after Meat. *Paul* calls it by the
 " 1 Cor. 10. 16. The *Cup of Blessing* which we bless, is it
 " nion of the *Blood of Christ*? &c. And this *Third Cup*
 " ter Supper (that is, after they had done Eating, and was
 " sion of the Supper) was the Cup which our Saviour
 " ply) applied to a new Spiritual Signification, &c. 6c.
 " 8. " After this they sung the *Hallel*, or *Hymn*. The Jews
 " three great Feasts, viz. of Unleavened Bread, or *Passover*
 " and of Tabernacles, were wont to sing their *Hallel* (which
 " led it) or at least some Part of it, which contained those *Spiritual*
 " sical Psalms, from the 113. to the 119. *Washing* of hands
 " and his Disciples did sing this *part of the Hallel*, or some Part of it,
 " some other more immediately (and more accommodated to this Occa-
 " sion, we are not assured: But it is probable, that they did sing
 " *Hymn* after this Paschal Supper, and then departed. And
 " these *Rites* were then in Use among the Jews, many years after
 " pear, that the Bread and Wine which were used at the
 " last Passover, and appointed to signify his Body and
 " Blood, were not wholly without the *Signification* of the
 " within the Compass of it, and *Rites* belonging to it, applied by him
 " now to a new Evangelical Use and Signification. And he dealt
 " otherwise in this Sacrament, than he did before in the Supper of *Banquet*
 " which he seems to have founded upon that *old Jewish Rite* among the
 " Jews, Of Purification by Water. So that our Saviour, in Instituting these
 " Sacraments of the New Testament, seems to have taken the *Old Rites*
 " of the Jews, and to have Ordained them to a new Evangelical Use
 " and Mystical Signification; and so (as one says) to have put a new
 " perscription upon the old Metal.
 " Thus *Craddock* not much varying therein, from the Account *God*
 " myn had before given of the same Matter, in his *Moses and Aaron*, l.
 " 3. c. 2. by which the observant and unbyassed Reader may see
 " that that which is called the Lord's Supper, was indeed the Jewish
 " Paschal Supper, performed with all the Rites and Ceremonies belong-
 " ing to the Jewish Passover, or then used by the Jews, in their Cele-
 " bration of that Feast. " This *Craddock* being a learned and judicious
 " Writer of the Church of England, and consequently one that had the
 " eating in Remembrance of Christ's Death, to be an Ordinance, or Sa-
 " crament as they call it. I hope a citation from so able a Man, may
 " gain Credit with all unbyassed; and if so, then *Joseph* *Jew's* Assertion
 " that the Disciples eat two Suppers the Night of the Passover, will be
 " the Ground for Want of Proof.

F I N I S.